# **RECORD OF TRIAL**

# **COVER SHEET**

IN THE
MILITARY COMMISSION
CASE OF

# UNITED STATES V. OMAR AHMED KHADR

**ALSO KNOWN AS:** 

AKHBAR FARHAD AKHBAR FARNAD

No. 050008

VOLUME VII OF \_\_\_\_ TOTAL VOLUMES

1<sup>ST</sup> VOLUME OF TRANSCRIPT JANUARY 11 & 12, 2006 SESSIONS (REDACTED VERSION)

### United States v. Omar Ahmed Khadr, No. 050008

### INDEX OF VOLUMES

A more detailed index for each volume is included at the front of the particular volume concerned. An electronic copy of the redacted version of this record of trial is available at http://www.defenselink.mil/news/commissions.html.

Some volumes have not been numbered on the covers. The numerical order for the volumes of the record of trial, as listed below, as well as the total number of volumes will change as litigation progresses and additional documents are added.

After trial is completed, the Presiding Officer will authenticate the final session transcript and exhibits, and the Appointing Authority will certify the records as administratively complete. The volumes of the record of trial will receive their final numbering just prior to the Appointing Authority's administrative certification.

Transcript and Review Exhibits are part of the record of trial, and are considered during appellate review. Volumes I-VI, however, are allied papers and as such are not part of the record of trial. Allied papers provide references, and show the administrative and historical processing of a case. Allied papers are not usually considered during appellate review. See generally United States v. Gonzalez, 60 M.J. 572, 574-575 (Army Ct. Crim. App. 2004) and cases cited therein discussing when allied papers may be considered during the military justice appellate process, which is governed by 10 U.S.C. § 866). For more information about allied papers in the military justice process, see Clerk of Military Commission administrative materials in Volume III.

<b>VOLUME</b>
---------------

### NUMBER SUBSTANCE OF CONTENTS\_

### **ALLIED PAPERS Not part of "record of trial"**

**T**\* Military Commission Primary References (Congressional Authorizations for Use of Force; Detainee Treatment Act; UCMJ articles; President's Military Order; Military Commission Orders; DoD Directive; Military Commission Instructions; Appointing Authority Regulations; Presiding Officer Memoranda—includes DoD rescinded publications)

11\* Supreme Court Decisions: Rasul v. Bush, 542 U.S. 466 (2004); Johnson v. Eisentrager, 339 U.S. 763 (1950); In re Yamashita, 327 U.S. 1 (1946); Ex Parte Quirin, 317 U.S. 1 (1942); Ex Parte Milligan, 71 U.S. 2 (1866)

III\* **DoD Decisions on Commissions including Appointing Authority** 

Interim volume numbers. Final numbers to be added when trial is completed.

### United States v. Omar Ahmed Khadr, No. 050008

### **INDEX OF VOLUMES**

VOLUME NUMBER	SUBSTANCE OF CONTENTS
	orders and decisions, Chief Clerk of Commissions documents
$\mathbf{I}\mathbf{V}^{\dagger}$	Federal Litigation in <i>Hamdan v. Rumsfeld</i> , at U.S. Supreme Court and D.C. Circuit
$\mathbf{V}^{\dagger}$	Federal Litigation at U.S. District Courts Not Filed by Counsel in United States v. Khadr
$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{I}^{\dagger}$	Selected filings and U.S. District Court decisions in <i>United States</i> v. Khadr

### **Record of Trial**

$\mathbf{VII}^{\dagger}$	Transcript (R. 1-231) (Jan. 11 and 12, 2006 sessions)
$\mathbf{VIII}^{\dagger}$	Transcript (R. 232-598) (April 5 and 7, 2006 sessions)
$\mathbf{IX}^{\dagger}$	Review Exhibits 1-53 (Jan. 11 and 12, 2006 sessions)
$\mathbf{X}^{\dagger}$	Review Exhibits 54-64 (Jan. 11 and 12, 2006 sessions)
$\mathbf{X}1^{\dagger}$	Review Exhibits 65-110 (April 5 and 7, 2006 sessions)
$\mathbf{X}11^{\dagger}$	Review Exhibits 111-134 (June , 2006 sessions)
$\mathbf{X}111^{\dagger}$	Review Exhibits 135-150 (June , 2006 sessions)
$\mathbf{X}1\mathbf{V}^{\dagger}$	Review Exhibits 151-152 (June , 2006 sessions)
$\mathbf{X}\mathbf{V}^{\dagger}$	Review Exhibits 153-15 (June , 2006 sessions)

<sup>†</sup> Interim volume numbers. Final numbers to be added when trial is completed.

### **VOLUME I OF TRANSCRIPT**

### **United States v. Omar Ahmed Khadr**

### **Index of Transcript**

# SESSION OF JANUARY 11-12, 2006:

DESCRIPTION	PAGE #
Appointing Order presented to Presiding Officer (RE 6)	<u>1</u>
President's Reason To Believe Determination presented to Presiding Officer ( <u>RE 3</u> )	<u>1</u>
Charges presented to Presiding Officer ( <u>RE 4</u> )	<u>2</u>
Approval and Referral of Charges presented to Presiding Officer (REs 5 & 7) respectively	<u>2</u>
Charges in Arabic presented to Presiding Officer ( <u>RE 42</u> )	<u>2</u>
Persons present at hearing	<u>2</u>
Detailing of Presiding Officer is presented at hearing ( <u>RE 6</u> )	<u>3</u>
Detailing of Prosecutors is presented at hearing (RE 8)	<u>4</u>
Detailing of Captain Merriam as Defense Counsel is presented at at hearing ( $\underline{RE 9}$ )	<u>4</u>
Detailing of Professor Ahmad as Defense Counsel is presented at at hearing ( $\underline{RE\ 11}$ )	<u>5</u>
Detailing of Professor Wilson Defense Counsel is presented at hearing, but Professor Wilson did not enter an appearance (RE	<u>6</u>
Defense Counsel indicates Mr. Khadr does not require a translate however translator support should remain on standby	or, <u>8-11</u>
Presiding Officer explained the right to counsel to Mr. Khadr	<u>13-16</u>

<u>DESCRIPTION</u> P	AGE #
The parties discussed the processing of the request for LtCol Vokey as selected military Defense Counsel. The pertinent documentati was presented to the Presiding Officer (R. 19; <u>REs 49-51</u> ). The request has not received a final decision from the Navy	
The Navy's concern is that LtCol Vokey's current duties may preclude him from spending sufficient time on Mr. Khadr's case	<u>21</u>
Professor Wilson's representation of Mr. Khadr discussed	<u>22</u>
Mr. Khadr will make his decision later about whether Captain Merriam's assistance is needed (assuming LtCol Vokey is assigne to defense team)—the Presiding Officer urges Mr. Khadr to keep both Captain Merriam and LtCol Vokey as Defense Counsel	
The Presiding Officer discussed denial of the Defense request for a continuance to wait for LtCol Vokey's assignment to defense team	25-27 m
Defense Counsel explains why a continuance should be granted- the Defense does not want to proceed until a decision is made about whether LtCol Vokey is going to be allowed to represent Mr. Khadr	<u>27-36</u>
Presiding Officer states all pleas and motions are reserved. Also new counsel will be allowed to do voir dire and exercise challeng	36-37 es
Defense Counsel objects to being required to conduct voir dire of the Presiding Officer	<u>37-38</u>
Presiding Officer denies request for a continuance and indicates Defense Counsel will have an opportunity to do voir dire and exercise challenges	<u>38-40</u>
Presiding Officer allows Defense Counsel to reserve voir dire	<u>42</u>
Defense counsel provides chart prepared by the Assistant to Presiding Officers (RE 52). It describes goals of MCI 8, para. 5 conferences ("8-5" sessions are in-chambers meetings attended Counsel and Presiding Officers)	by

DESCRIPTION	PAGE #
Defense Counsel objects to 8-5 sessions	<u>45-53</u>
Presiding officer is not familiar with RE 52	<u>53</u>
Defense counsel asks to voir dire Assistant to Presiding Officer at to preserve records of communications between Presiding Officer and Assistant to Presiding Officers and other Commission officers	eers
Presiding officer denies motion, but advises it can be raised at a subsequent proceeding	<u>56</u>
Defense objects to Prosecution voir dire of the Presiding Officer	<u>58-56</u>
Presiding Officer's biographical materials ( <u>REs 18 &amp; 29</u> ) are presented	<u>58-59</u>
Prosecution voir dire of the Presiding Officer—the Prosecution dinot challenge the Presiding Officer	id <u>60-74</u>
Presiding Officer reminds Defense Counsel that voir dire and challenges are reserved	<u>74-75</u>
General nature of the charges described, and reading of the charg waived	ges <u>77-78</u>
Discussions concerning three protective orders. First two are presented ( <u>REs 45 &amp; 46</u> ). Third one will be resolved later	<u>79-82</u>
All Presiding Officer Memoranda are presented (RE 44)	<u>82</u>
Current Filings Inventory is presented (RE 43)	83-84
Defense counsel makes a motion concerning the Chief Prosecutor's statements at a press conference. Defense wants an order precluding violations of attorney-ethical rules, and to remediat prosecution statements made to the press, such as by a retraction (R. 88-91). After some discussion, the Presiding Officer ordered briefs from the parties on this issue	

DESCRIPTION	PAGE #
The Presiding Officer announced that the motion for abatement because of any conflict between the President's Order and the Secretary of Defense's Order was denied without prejudice—th motion should be made during a scheduled motions session (RE	
Presiding Officer presents his Discovery Order ( <u>RE 20</u> ). The Presiding Officer also discusses scheduling of discovery	<u>115-116</u>
Arraignment (Presiding Officer requests Mr. Khadr's pleas), and Mr. Khadr reserves his pleas	<u>118-119</u>
The Presiding Officer describes dates for next proceedings in Mr. Khadr's case	<u>121</u>
Defense notes from an 8-5 session are presented ( <u>RE 54</u> )	<u>122</u>
Hearing recessed at 1937, Jan. 11, 2006 overnight	<u>123</u>
Prosecution and Presiding Officer comments concerning <u>RE 54</u>	126-133
Presiding Officer notes Mr. Khadr is in proper attire	129-130
Presiding Officer directs Accused to be referred to as the "Accused" or as "Mr. Khadr" not by his first name, "Omar"	<u>130-131</u>
Defense Counsel indicate that Mr. Khadr does not require a translator, but might if matters were complex	133-136
The most recent Filings Inventory was presented ( <u>RE 61</u> )	<u>138</u>
Email traffic concerning LtCol Vokey's availability presented (RE 56). The Presiding Officer encourages CPT Merriam to remain on the case, even if LtCol Vokey is approved as Selected Defense Counsel	138-139
Mr. Khadr wants to consult with LtCol Vokey before deciding whether he wants a Canadian counsel	140-142
Presiding Officer asks about Mr. Khadr's health issues, but	142-143

DESCRIPTION	PAGE #
the Defense is not prepared to address such an issue—the Defense agrees to surface any such issue as early as possible	
The Presiding Officer notes that some of the documents submittee on the issue of the Chief Prosecutor's comments to the media a press conference are missing some letters on the edges of page	ıt
The Defense brief is ( <u>RE 53</u> ) and the Government's brief on the legitimacy of the Chief Prosecutor's comments to the media at a press conference are ( <u>RE 60</u> )	146-147
Extensive litigation concerning whether the Chief Prosecutor's comments to the media at a press conference	149-230
A 52-minute DVD of the Press Conference at issue was played at the hearing. The DVD is ( $\underbrace{RE~62}$ ) (R. 209)	<u>173-174</u>
Presiding Officer notes the Defense has alleged unlawful or unprofessional conduct by the Prosecution, that is, to use evidence obtained by torture, and that the proceedings are a sham—The Chief Prosecutor has made statements as to his personal belief concerning the Accused's guilt	<u>187-190</u>
Defense asserts that the Government is held to a more restrictive standard than the Defense in comments to the press	204-206
Prosecution arguments on motion about the Chief Prosecutor's comments to the media at a press conference	211-221
RE 65 is presented to the Presiding Officer	<u>220</u>
Defense concluding comments on motion about the Chief Prosecutor's comments to the media at a press conference	221-222
The Presiding Officer's findings of facts and conclusions of law on Defense motion about the Chief Prosecutor's alleged improper communications to the media at a press conference —Defense motion is ultimately denied (R. 230)	223-230

DESCRIPTION	PAGE #
Findings of Fact	225-227
Conclusions of Law	227-230
Commission recessed at 2023, Jan. 12, 2006	<u>230</u>
Authentication for pages 1-231	<u>231</u>

2	11 January 2006.
3	
4	[Throughout this transcript, Major U.S.
5	Marine Corps will be referred to as the Prosecutor or
6	PROS. Lieutenant U.S. Navy, will be
7	referred to as the Assistant Prosecutor or APROS.
8	Captain John Merriam, U.S. Army, will be referred to as
9	the Detailed Defense Counsel or DC. Professor Muneer
10	Ahmad will be referred to as Civilian Defense Counsel or
11	CDC.]
12	
13	Presiding Officer: This military Commission will come to
14	order. Prosecutor?
15	
16	PROS: Sir, this military Commission is appointed by
17	Appointing Order 05-0004, dated 23 November
18	2005. Copies of the appointing order have been
19	furnished to the Presiding Officer, counsel, and
20	the accused. And they have been marked as
21	Review Exhibit 6 and attached to the record.
22	
23	The Presidential determination that the accused
24	may be subject to trial by military Commission

The Commissions Hearing was called to order at 1530,

1	has been marked as Review Exhibit 3 and has been
2	previously shown to the defense.
3	
4	The charges have been marked as Review Exhibit 4
5	and have been properly approved by the
6	Appointing Authority and referred to the
7	Commission for trial. The approval of the
8	charges and the referral to this Commission have
9	been marked as Review Exhibits 5 and 7
10	respectively.
11	
12	The prosecution caused a copy of the charges in
13	English to be served on the accused on 30
14	November 2005. A copy of the charges have been
15	translated into Arabic and are attached to the
16	record as Review Exhibit 42.
17	
18	The Prosecution is ready to proceed in the
19	Commission trial of the United States versus
20	Omar Khadr. The accused and the following
21	personnel detailed to this Commission are
22	present:
23	

Colonel Chester, the Presiding Officer;

1	myself, Major the lead
2	Prosecutor;
3	Lieutenant the Assistant
4	Prosecutor;
5	Captain John Merriam, the Detailed Defense
6	counsel;
7	And Mr. Muneer Ahmad, the Civilian Defense
8	Counsel;
9	Lieutenant has also been
10	detailed as an Assistant Prosecutor and has
11	been excused from this session by the detailing
12	authority.
13	
14	A court reporter has been detailed for this
15	Commission, and has previously been sworn.
16	Security personnel have been detailed for this
17	Commission and have also been previously sworn.
18	
19	Presiding Officer: All right. I've been designated the
20	Presiding Officer for this military Commission
21	by the Appointing Authority, and I have been
22	previously sworn. That appointment is marked as
23	RE 6.

1		Prosecutor, please state by whom you were
2		detailed and what your legal qualifications and
3		status as to oath are.
4		
5	PROS:	Yes, sir. All members of the prosecution have
6		been detailed to this military Commission by the
7		Chief Prosecutor. All members of the
8		prosecution are qualified under Military
9		Commission Order Number 1 Paragraph 4(b) and we
10		have been previously sworn.
11		
12		No member of the prosecution has acted in any
13		manner which might tend to disqualify us in this
14		proceeding. The detailing document has been
15		marked as Review Exhibit Number 8.
16		
17	Presiding	g Officer: Captain Merriam, would you please
18		state your legal qualifications, status as to
19		oath, and by whom you were detailed.
20		
21	DC:	Yes, sir. I have been detailed to this military
22		Commission by the Chief Defense Counsel. I am
23		Qualified under Military Commission Order Number
24		1, Paragraph 4(c), and I have previously been

sworn. I have not acted in any manner that
might tend to disqualify me in this proceeding.

The document detailing counsel has been marked
as Review Exhibit 9.

5

6

7

8

Presiding Officer: Thank you. Mr. Ahmad, could you please state your legal qualifications, please, and your status as to oath.

9

Yes, sir. I am a civilian counsel who has been 10 CDC: determined to be qualified for membership in the 11 pool of qualified civilian defense counsel in 12 accordance with Section 4(c)(3)of Military 13 Commission Order Number 1. I have transmitted 14 my notice of appearance through the Chief 15 Defense Counsel. I have signed the civilian 16 counsel agreement to practice before military 17 commissions and I have not acted in a manner 18 that may tend to disqualify me to practice in 19 this proceeding. I have not been sworn. 20 notice of appearance including the qualification 21 determination has been marked as Review 22 Exhibit 11. 23

1	Presiding Officer: All right, you say you have not been	n
2	sworn?	
3		
4	CDC: I have not yet, sir.	
5		
6	Presiding Officer: All, right. You will be sworn at the	his
7	time.	
8		
9	The Civilian Defense Counsel was sworn.	
10		
11	Presiding Officer: Captain Merriam, are there any other	r
12	defense counsel detailed or assigned to this	
13	case at this time?	
14		
15	DC: Yes, sir. There is one other defense counsel,	
16	Civilian Defense Counsel, detailed to the case	,
17	Professor Richard Wilson. He is not currently	
18	present, sir, and has not entered an appearanc	е
19	in this matter.	
20		
21	Presiding Officer: All right. Thank you.	
22		
23	What I want to do at this point is take up a	
24	matter of an 8-5 Conference that was held. At	

1		that conference present were Major
2		the trial counsel or rather, the prosecutor
3		in this case; the Detailed Defense Counsel,
4		Captain Merriam; Civilian Defense Counsel, Mr.
5		Ahmad. Also present was the Assistant to the
6		Presiding Officer, Mr. Hodges; and, of course,
7		myself. That occurred on 10 January 2006.
8		During that conference one of the issues that we
9		discussed amongst several was the issue of
10		translators and the ability of Mr. Khadr to
11		understand these proceedings.
12		
13		Defense Counsel, and I'm not sure who is going
14		to be the lead will that be you, Captain
15		Merriam, or Mr. Ahmad?
16		
17	DC:	Sir, I am not sure that has been determined yet.
18		Mr. Ahmad is going to
19		
20	Presiding	Officer: Take this issue?
21		
22	DC:	Yes, sir.
23		

Presiding Officer: Mr. Ahmad, have you had a chance to

determine whether Mr. Khadr can understand these proceedings if they are all spoken in English?

3

1

2

Sir, I believe that he will be able to DC: 4 understand them. I would note that in the 8-5 5 that we had, you had made arrangements for 6 interpretation to be provided. Omar has been 7 informed on the fact that that is available to 8 him and the headset is here. My understanding 9 is that given that this is a preliminary 10 hearing, I think that he will be able to 11 understand it. However, we've never been in a 12 situation in the course of our representation of 13 him where he has had to deal with the 14 terminology and concepts as complicated as we 15 expect to be here. Especially since he has been 16 without educational instruction for several 17 18 years.

19

20

21

22

23

24

So because of that, what we would like to do is
to reserve -- to see how it goes today. And I
believe that he, up until now, he's been
listening in English and understanding. If
there comes a time when that is not the case,

1		I'll notify you of that, sir, and I think at the
2		end of this session we'll have a better idea of
3		what our needs will be for future sessions.
4		
5	Presidin	g Officer: All right, thank you.
6		
7		Mr. Khadr, do you understand what your Defense
8		Counsel, Mr. Ahmad just said?
9		
10	ACC:	Yes, sir.
11		
12	Presidin	g Officer: I need you to please speak up so that
13		I can hear you. All right?
14		
15	ACC:	Yes, sir.
16		
17	Presidin	g Officer: If, and presently there is a
18		translator available, there is a set of
19		headphones on the table in front you. If for
20		some reason we get to a point where you cannot
21		understand the discussion and you need to make
22		use of that service, please feel free to do so.
23		If I say something or something is being
24		discussed that you don't understand, please

1		either yourself indicate or have Mr. Ahmad tell
2		me, and we will stop and go back over it so that
3		you understand what's being said.
4		
5		Do you understand this?
6		
7	ACC:	Yes, sir.
8		
9	Presidin	g Officer: I consider it very important that you
10		understand everything that we are doing today as
11		well as throughout these proceedings. So again,
12		I want to make sure you understand if you do
13		have a problem with the language let me know.
14		All right?
15		
16	ACC:	Yes, sir.
17		
18	Presidin	g Officer: I understand, defense, that you do
19		not at this time have a defense translator. Is
20		that correct?
21		
22	CDC:	That is right, sir.
23		
24	Presidin	g Officer: Have you asked for one?

```
1
                We have not at this point. And again, I think
2
      CDC:
                that our plan will be to evaluate the need for
3
                one based on how things go today.
4
5
      Presiding Officer: If that becomes an issue please let
6
7
                me know and we can take it up and address it as
8
                necessary.
9
                Thank you, sir.
10
      CDC:
11
      Presiding Officer: Thank you.
12
13
                Mr. Khadr, I want to discuss with you right now
14
                your right to counsel.
15
16
                Excuse me, sir.
      DC:
17
18
      Presiding Officer: Pursuant to military Commission --
19
20
21
      DC:
                Sir --
22
      Presiding Officer: I am sorry.
23
```

1	DC:	Forgive me. Since we've already begun the
2		discussion about the 8-5 I wonder if this might
3		now be a good time to go ahead and review what
4		else transpired in the 8-5 so that we can see
5		that
6		
7	Presiding	g Officer: I would rather I would rather hold
8		that until later. What I'd like to do right now
9		is get through counsel rights. I understand
10		that there's an outstanding issue, and I want to
11		take that up as far as Lieutenant Colonel Vokey.
12		Is there a reason you think you need to do it
13		right now?
14		
15	DC:	Sir, we've already raised the issue. The 8-5
16		occurred over defense objection
17		
18	Presiding	g Officer: Well
19		
20	DC:	there are reasons for that objection and I
21		want to make sure that we air those now while
22		the door is open to that conversation, sir.
23		

Presiding Officer: And I told you that I will give you

1	that opportunity.
2	
3	DC: All right, sir.
4	
5	Presiding Officer: If I don't, stand up, tell me that I
6	forgot to
7	
8	DC: Yes, sir.
9	
10	Presiding Officer: and I will give you that
11	opportunity. All right?
12	
13	DC: Yes, sir, understood.
14	
15	Presiding Officer: What I want to do right now is make
16	sure Mr. Khadr understands his right to counsel
17	and that we take up that issue.
18	
19	DC: Yes, sir. Thank you. I understand.
20	
21	Presiding Officer: Mr. Khadr, I want to talk to you
22	right now about your right to counsel per
23	Military Commission Order Number 1. You are
24	represented by Captain Merriam. He is your

1 Detailed Defense Counsel. You also have a right to request a different military counsel 2 represent you. If the person you request is 3 reasonably available, he or she would be 4 appointed to represent you as your detailed 5 Defense counsel. If you are represented by a 6 detailed defense counsel of your own choosing, 7 you would normally lose the services of Captain 8 Merriam. You could, however, request that 9 Captain Merriam remain on your case and the 10 authority that detailed him; that is, the Chief 11 Defense Counsel for the military Commissions, in 12 his sole discretion, could grant or deny your 13 request. 14 15 Do you understand this? 16 17 Yes, sir. 18 ACC: 19 Presiding Officer: Detailed defense counsel are provided to 20 21 you free of charge. Do you understand this? 22 Yes, sir. 23 ACC:

14

1	Presiding	officer: Again, I would ask you if you could
2		either speak up or maybe Mr. Ahmad, you could
3		pull the microphone closer. It will pick up his
4		voice a lot better.
5		
6	CDC:	Sir, does this need to be
7		
8	Presiding	officer: Pardon?
9		
10	CDC:	does anything need to be pressed in
11		order for this to operate or is it picking
12		up his voice?
13		
14	Presiding	officer: It's voice activated, so if he speaks
15		up, it will pick his voice up.
16		
17	DC:	All right, sir.
18		
19	Presiding	officer: In addition to detailed defense
20		counsel you have the right to be represented by
21		a qualified civilian lawyer. A civilian lawyer
22		would represent you at no expense to the United
23		States government.

1 To be qualified, he or she must be a U. S. citizen, admitted to the practice of law in a 2 state, district, or territory or possession of 3 the United States, or admitted to practice in 4 front of a United States federal court, may not 5 have been sanctioned or disciplined for any 6 relevant misconduct, be eligible for a secret 7 clearance, and agree in writing to comply with 8 the orders, rules, and regulations of this 9 military Commission. If a civilian lawyer 10 represents you, your detailed defense counsel 11 will continue to represent you as well. And 12 that detailed defense counsel will be present 13 during the presentation of all evidence. 14 15 Do you understand what I've just told you? 16 17 Yes, sir. 18 ACC: 19 Presiding Officer: Do you have any questions about your 20 right to counsel? 21 22 23 ACC: No.

1	Presiding Officer: All right. As I mentioned, it is
2	Captain Merriam, you mentioned, again, we did
3	have an 802 conference on the 10th. We had an
4	additional 802 conference today, in which not
5	only the people I cited before were present, but
6	also the assistant prosecutor, Lieutenant
7	was also present. And at that time we discussed
8	the issue of the defense request for a specific
9	detailed defense counsel My understanding is
10	that that request was submitted to the Judge
11	Advocate General of the Navy through the Staff
12	Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine
13	Corps, that that was forwarded by the Staff
14	Judge Advocate to the Commandant of Marine
15	Corps, to the Judge Advocate General of the
16	Navy, with some reservations or questions. It
17	was in turn forwarded to the Chief Defense
18	Counsel for these military Commissions for
19	comment by the Judge Advocate General of the
20	Navy. And that has been provided, those
21	comments have been returned to the Judge
22	Advocate General of the Navy.

Captain Merriam, have those documents been

1		marked as review exhibits?
2		
3	DC:	No, sir, they have not. I have them here and I
4		will offer them now. I will provide a copy to
5		you, the court reporter, and the prosecution.
6		
7	Presidin	g Officer: All rightif you would do that.
8		
9	DC:	Yes, sir. One moment. Sir, I am going to pass
10		three documents. The first one is a memorandum
11		from the Staff Judge Advocate
12		
13	Presidin	g Officer: Let me ask you to do this, please.
14		
15	DC:	Yes, sir.
16		
17	Presidin	g Officer: Have they been marked as review
18		exhibits?
19		
20	DC:	They have not, sir.
21		
22	Presidin	g Officer: All right. What I would ask you to
23		do is have them marked and then pass them and
24		refer to them by their exhibit numbers

```
1
      The exhibits were marked.
2
               Yes, sir. Sir, I've handed you what's been
3
      DC:
               marked as Review Exhibits 49, 50, and 51.
4
5
      Presiding Officer: Prosecutor, do you have a copy of
6
7
                these?
8
      PROS: Yes, sir, I do.
9
10
      Presiding Officer: Thank you. Let me take a minute to
11
                look at these.
12
13
      DC:
               Yes, sir.
14
15
      Presiding Officer: Captain Merriam, you've read, in
16
               particular, RE 51?
17
18
               Yes, sir. I have.
      DC:
19
20
      Presiding Officer: Specifically looking at -- and I'm
21
                referring to Paragraph 5. It deals with the
22
                expectations of General
23
```

```
1
      DC:
               Paragraph 5 to 51, sir?
2
      Presiding Officer: Yes.
3
4
               The Email?
      DC:
5
6
7
      Presiding Officer: Fifty one is the Email from Colonel
                Sullivan to the Judge Advocate General of the
8
                Navy.
9
10
      DC:
               Yes, sir.
11
12
      Presiding Officer: Have you read through that?
13
14
               Yes, sir, I have.
15
      DC:
16
      Presiding Officer: Do you have any reservations there or
17
                concerns with that? And if you want to take a
18
                minute and discuss that with Mr. Ahmad, feel
19
                free to --
20
21
      DC: Yes, sir, I will.
22
23
      Presiding Officer: -- or with your client.
```

2 DC: Sir, I don't have any objection to that.

3

Presiding Officer: All right. I will -- I was going to 4 note it later, but I will note for the record 5 6 right now that in my other responsibilities I am 7 the Circuit Military Judge for the Sierra Circuit, which is essentially the same circuit 8 that Lieutenant Colonel Vokey services in his 9 capacity as the Regional Defense Counsel. 10 also very familiar with Lieutenant Colonel Vokey 11 and know him to be a very competent and zealous 12 advocate for his clients. I also know him to be 13 very busy. That's why I asked the question. 14 The Sierra Circuit is the busiest trial circuit 15 in the Department of Defense. 16

17

Sir, I understand your concern. Just for the
record, the paragraph we're talking about is the
paragraph in which it says that it's a
representation by the Chief Defense Counsel of
the Military Commissions relating an
understanding between him and the Chief Defense
Counsel of the Marine Corps, to the effect that

1 they will both work together to ensure that Lieutenant Colonel Vokey's duties, with respect 2 to the Khadr case, will not interfere with his 3 ability to do his duties as regional Defense 4 counsel. There are any number of ways that both 5 of those two -- that the Chief Defense Counsels 6 can operate to that effect that have nothing to 7 do with his ability to represent Mr. Khadr. 8 9 Presiding Officer: So you are saying --10 11 They provide other counsel to the region. DC: 12 13 Presiding Officer: You're comfortable with this? 14 15 DC: Yes, sir. 16 17 Presiding Officer: I think you mentioned also that 18 Mr. Richard J. Wilson has been detailed to this 19 case and he has not appeared before this 20 21 Commission, has made no appearance. Has that status changed at all in terms of his 22 representation of Mr. Khadr? 23

1 DC: No, sir, it has not changed. 2 Presiding Officer: And during our 8-5 that we had today, 3 one of the issues I asked counsel to discuss 4 with Mr. Khadr, again, I'll give you leave to 5 6 take a pass on it if you desire to, is whether 7 or not, because his request is silent on that issue, does he want 8 9 Captain Merriam to remain on the case or not? 10 11 Sir, I don't think Mr. Khadr has come to a DC: 12 conclusion about that. I think that is 13 something he wants to discuss with Colonel 14 Vokey, assuming Colonel Vokey is detailed to 15 this case. 16 17 Presiding Officer: That's fair enough. That's fair 18 enough. It would be my recommendation, however, 19 and I will ask you, Captain Merriam, to 20 communicate it to Colonel Sullivan. Prosecutor, 21 I'd ask that you communicate it to the 22 Appointing Authority. 23

1		Captain Merriam, should Lieutenant Colonel Vokey
2		be made available that Captain Merriam does
3		remain on the case as Assistant Detailed Defense
4		Counsel. I think that the issues are big
5		enough, and that there is enough work for both
6		of them to be fully employed or engaged in this
7		process. You will please communicate that with
8		
9		
10	PROS:	Yes, sir.
11		
12	Presiding	g Officer: My respects.
13		
14		Mr. Khadr, I understand at this point you want
15		Lieutenant Colonel Vokey to be your detailed
16		Defense counsel. And as it stands right now you
17		are represented by Captain Merriam and Mr.
18		Ahmad. Is there any other defense counsel you
19		want to represent you, military or civilian?
20		
21	ACC:	I would like I want a Canadian lawyer of my
22		choice to be added on to my legal team.
23		

Presiding Officer: All right. At this point that's not

possible. I will invite your defense counsel to
make that the subject of an appropriate motion,
which we will schedule to take place in the
future. Do you understand that?

5

6 ACC: Yes, sir.

7

Presiding Officer: And with their assistance we will present that and I will decide that issue for you. All right?

11

12 ACC: Thank you, sir.

13

Presiding Officer: And I guess I'll take it up at this 14 point, Captain Merriam. And that is your motion 15 for a continuance. As I had indicated, that's 16 in the REs, I was denying your motion. I did 17 not indicate I was making any ruling on the 18 issue of the availability of whether or not 19 Lieutenant Colonel Vokey should represent the 20 accused. Do you want to state anything further? 21 When I say "further," beyond what is in your 22 written brief that was attached to the record at 23 this time concerning the motion for a 24

1		continuance?
2		
3	DC:	Sir, I suppose I do. We should back up just to
4		state for the record; first of all, what that
5		motion was predicated on, and also what these
6		review exhibits that I just offered have to do
7		with that. And that will maybe explain why I
8		want to discuss this motion again now.
9		
10	Presidin	g Officer: All right. So long as we're
11		
12	DC:	No, sir. I
13		
14	Presidin	g Officer: I don't want to litigate the
15		availability of Colonel Vokey or anything else,
16		just the motion for continuance. All right?
17		
18	DC:	Understood, sir. We would reserve the right to
19		litigate the availability of Colonel Vokey, but
20		that to me seems like it's not ripe until he's
21		been determined unavailable.
22		
23	Presidin	g Officer: I agree and I as I indicated
24		during the 0 5 if you want to make guch a

motion, and I think I also indicated that I was not ruling on the issue of Colonel Vokey. And should you decide to make that motion and brief it, the trial counsel or prosecutor rather would get an opportunity to respond to it and we would take it up at an appropriate motion session.

DC:

Yes, sir. Just to briefly recap. The accused requested Colonel Vokey properly and in a timely fashion in accordance with MCI Number 4 and MCO Number 1. That request was forwarded to the appropriate representative of the government and as of January 6th had not been acted on. That was day fourteen, I believe, since the request was submitted.

At that point the defense filed a motion requesting a continuance, because there had been no decision. Requested that on three grounds, essentially; either he is going to be granted, in which case, he may not have time to prepare for this session; he is going to be denied, in which case we want the opportunity to seek additional counsel; or we will be in the

position we find ourselves in today, which is,
there has been no action taken although there is
strong indications, based on the review exhibits
I have just admitted, that it's very likely he
will be detailed to this case.

So I guess the facts have changed, and now we are on day 19 without a decision, but we now have strong indications that the decision, at least in my opinion strong indications, that it will be ultimately determined that he is available and that he will be detailed to this case. So to my mind, at this point, having heard his counsel -- yes, sir?

Presiding Officer: Slow down, please.

Okay, sir. To my mind, having heard the accused on the record state that he wants Lieutenant Colonel Vokey to represent him, this session should be terminated at this point, continued until Colonel Vokey -- until either a decision has been made, or if it's been granted, until he

1		is present.
2		
3		The way I see this, sir, this is clear based on
4		the same case law I cited in my motion. And to
5		me it seems to me that there is nothing else to
6		be done in this session, other than discussion
7		of the 8-5 session and clean up the record in
8		that regard, and then continuing the session
9		until Colonel Vokey is either available or not.
10		
11		Sir, we essentially
12		
13	Presiding	g Officer: Are you going to say something,
14		Captain Merriam?
15		
16	DC:	Yes, sir. I just want to make sure we are being
17		very clear. This is a fundamental
18		
19	Presiding	g Officer: Please speak slower.
20		
21	DC:	Yes, sir.
22		
23	Presiding	g Officer: Not only for my benefit, but for the
24		court reporter's benefit, as she's taking down

what you are saying, and you have got a client there whose grasp of English is perhaps not quite as good as yours and mine. DC: I understand, sir. I'll speak slower. I'm a little excited about this. Presiding Officer: That's all right. This is a fundamental right. This is a right DC: that the government, when they wrote the rules for these Commissions, decided to extend to the accused. This is a right that parallels the rights we have in civilian courts. It parallels 

This is not a hard matter of law here. This is a very, very basic right. And it would be an extraordinarily hollow right if we were to say, You have the right to the counsel of your choice. Here is how you request that, and you have done that. Here is the timing that we expect out of you. We expect no appearance of unreasonable delay. And you haven't shown any

the rights we have in courts-martial.

such delay. But when that counsel -- when we haven't acted on that decision, we the government, who created this right for you, and are the only people who can grant it, who can grant your request, haven't acted on it, we are going to force you to appear at your first Commission session and enter pleas or reserve them, make declarations about motions, conduct voir dire of the Presiding Officer; those are all things that we were brought here to ostensibly do. The government is the one who has this request in their hands and hasn't acted on it. So it should not be a hard decision to come to that, at this point, the accused has made his wishes with respect to counsel known. It's not me, sir. He doesn't want me. He wants Lieutenant Colonel Vokey.

18

20

21

22

23

24

We have every indication that Lieutenant Colonel Vokey is going to be found available. He's not here. So at this point it seems to me it should not be a very hard decision to come to that we don't really have much more business to conduct here, other than to take matters that happened

in 8-5, and otherwise, you know, police up the record and then move on. But all of the things that follow after this, everything from this point forward, in fact, probably what I'm doing right now, this is advocacy. This is more than merely procedure. This is advocacy. And he's entitled to the advocate that he has selected. And he doesn't have that.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

7

8

So I suppose what I'm doing is renewing the motion that you previously denied to continue this case until he has that advocate. And it seems to me that we are in an odd position. Either everything that follows after this is a critically important step in this trial, voir dire, entering of pleas, or it's unimportant procedural stuff. Either way, what have we lost by waiting until his counsel is present? these are critical and important steps, as I believe they are, then we are depriving him of his right. And if they are unimportant, then what is everyone in such a rush for? So I -- I just want -- I guess I am renewing the motion to continue the case. I think that the only

1	business we still have to
2	
3	Presiding Officer: Is there anything new you want to
4	say?
5	
6	DC: No, sir.
7	
8	Presiding Officer: Okay, thank you. Prosecutor, do
9	you have anything you want to add?
10	
11	PROS (Maj : Just briefly, sir. The accused's
12	right to a full and fair trial will not be
13	effected by completing this session that we've
14	scheduled today. In the event that Lieutenant
15	Colonel Vokey or any other selected counsel is
16	detailed to this case they will have the
17	opportunity to raise this as an issue before the
18	Commission at that point. So proceeding today
19	does not violate any rights of the accused. In
20	the event that Lieutenant Colonel Vokey would
21	like to conduct additional voir dire at a later
22	date, I certainly would not object to him
23	conducting additional voir dire on areas that

were not covered by counsel today or to ask

questions that were not asked today.

2

1

Presiding Officer: Thank you. I would note for the 3 record, Captain Merriam, on the week of 4 10 December 2005, I believe you and Mr. Ahmad 5 were in Guantanamo Bay to meet with your client, 6 and there was a discussion that took place 7 between you and -- or not you, but between 8 Colonel Sullivan and Mr. Hodges, where it was 9 attempted to learn who is -- what Mr. Ahmad's 10 desires were with respect to counsel. 11

12

DC: Mr. Khadr's, sir.

14

13

Presiding Officer: I'm sorry, Mr. Khadr. Thank you. 15 And the defense was unwilling to provide any 16 information so we could better address when to 17 schedule the session. Also your, and it's 18 RE-36, Mr. Khadr submitted a request that was 19 dated, I believe, the 14th of December. It was 20 not acted upon by Colonel Sullivan until the 21 23rd of December. And I think the first time I 22 saw it was when you or Mr. Ahmad provided it to 23 myself and Mr. Hodges as part of your motion for 24

1		a continuance at about 1700, Thursday of last
2		week; which was just a few hours before I was,
3		myself, supposed to get on an airplane to come
4		out here, which is why I acted on the request at
5		the time as I indicated in my action on it, that
6		I didn't consider your motion timely then.
7		Given he had submitted that request or signed
8		that request on the 14th, my not finding out
9		about it until hours before I got on an airplane
10		to come here, I don't consider timely.
11		
12	DC:	Sir, I can if I could, I'd like to address
13		that issue.
14		
15	Presiding	g Officer: Pardon, me?
16		
17	DC:	I'd like to address that issue.
18		
19	Presiding	g Officer: Well I'll give you an opportunity to
20		address it in a minute. Sit down, please.
21		
22	The defe	nse counsel did as directed.
23		

Presiding Officer: Also, during the 8-5 I said yesterday

and again today that I would give the defense the opportunity to reserve pleas, to reserve motions, that if Colonel Vokey or some other counsel was made available as the Selected Detailed Defense Counsel I would give that individual the opportunity to conduct voir dire of myself at that later time, that my intent was to get these proceedings started so that we would at least get on the record what Mr. Khadr's desires were with respect to counsel and the other matters, and also to come up with at least the beginnings of a trial schedule. Given the logistics of getting down here, getting everyone together, I think that is still the prudent thing to do. And I still intend to push forward.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

As I said, I intend to give the counsel an opportunity to exercise voir dire, challenges of the Presiding Officer. I will ask you if you have motions. I will give you the opportunity to reserve those motions, and I will also give you the opportunity to reserve pleas. And as I said, if there's another counsel made available

as detailed counsel, I will give that individual the opportunity to raise or conduct voir dire and exercise challenges against myself as the Presiding Officer, if that individual determines that's what he wants to do. So we will press forward. Your renewed motion for a continuance is again -- I'm sorry, you wanted to say something?

Yes, sir. I just want to make sure I understand
you correctly. We are going -- you are going
to -- you're going to require us to go forward
into voir dire today, but at the same time you
are saying that we can do voir dire again
when -- when and if new counsel is assigned to
this case.

Presiding Officer: Correct.

**DC:** So I'm not sure I understand what the point of
21 doing voir dire today is if you are already
22 saying that you are going to allow voir dire at
23 a later date by the accused's chosen advocate.
24 And to me actually the system -- of being forced

Merriam. You will have the opportunity. How you choose to exercise that opportunity is you choice. You are currently representing Mr.  Khadr, as is Mr. Ahmad. You've known since I believe it was the 2nd of December that we wer coming down here to accomplish those tasks. I would assume that you were prepared to do that As I indicated, if you want to or the new counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have that opportunity. If you desire to make additional motions on it, we are going to have motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed	1	to make a decision about it, is itself error
Merriam. You will have the opportunity. How you choose to exercise that opportunity is you choice. You are currently representing Mr. Khadr, as is Mr. Ahmad. You've known since I believe it was the 2nd of December that we wer coming down here to accomplish those tasks. I would assume that you were prepared to do that As I indicated, if you want to or the new counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have that opportunity. If you desire to make additional motions on it, we are going to have motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	2	because
Merriam. You will have the opportunity. How you choose to exercise that opportunity is you choice. You are currently representing Mr.  Khadr, as is Mr. Ahmad. You've known since I believe it was the 2nd of December that we wer coming down here to accomplish those tasks. I would assume that you were prepared to do that As I indicated, if you want to or the new counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have that opportunity. If you desire to make additional motions on it, we are going to have motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	3	
you choose to exercise that opportunity is you choice. You are currently representing Mr.  Khadr, as is Mr. Ahmad. You've known since I believe it was the 2nd of December that we wer coming down here to accomplish those tasks. I would assume that you were prepared to do that As I indicated, if you want to or the new counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have that opportunity. If you desire to make additional motions on it, we are going to have motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	4	Presiding Officer: I understand your position, Captain
choice. You are currently representing Mr.  Khadr, as is Mr. Ahmad. You've known since I  believe it was the 2nd of December that we wer  coming down here to accomplish those tasks. I  would assume that you were prepared to do that  As I indicated, if you want to or the new  counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have  that opportunity. If you desire to make  additional motions on it, we are going to have  motions session, which we intend to set today  least preliminarily. And we are going to pres  forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed  motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe  on that?	5	Merriam. You will have the opportunity. How
Khadr, as is Mr. Ahmad. You've known since I  believe it was the 2nd of December that we wer  coming down here to accomplish those tasks. I  would assume that you were prepared to do that  As I indicated, if you want to or the new  counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have  that opportunity. If you desire to make  additional motions on it, we are going to have  motions session, which we intend to set today  least preliminarily. And we are going to pres  forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed  motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe  on that?	6	you choose to exercise that opportunity is your
believe it was the 2nd of December that we wer coming down here to accomplish those tasks. I would assume that you were prepared to do that As I indicated, if you want to or the new counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have that opportunity. If you desire to make additional motions on it, we are going to have motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	7	choice. You are currently representing Mr.
coming down here to accomplish those tasks. I  would assume that you were prepared to do that  As I indicated, if you want to or the new  counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have  that opportunity. If you desire to make  additional motions on it, we are going to have  motions session, which we intend to set today  least preliminarily. And we are going to pres  forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed  motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe  on that?	8	Khadr, as is Mr. Ahmad. You've known since I
would assume that you were prepared to do that  As I indicated, if you want to or the new  counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have  that opportunity. If you desire to make  additional motions on it, we are going to have  motions session, which we intend to set today  least preliminarily. And we are going to pres  forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed  motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe  on that?	9	believe it was the 2nd of December that we were
As I indicated, if you want to or the new counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have that opportunity. If you desire to make additional motions on it, we are going to have motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	10	coming down here to accomplish those tasks. I
counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have that opportunity. If you desire to make additional motions on it, we are going to have motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	11	would assume that you were prepared to do that.
that opportunity. If you desire to make additional motions on it, we are going to have motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	12	As I indicated, if you want to or the new
additional motions on it, we are going to have motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	13	counsel desires to raise it again, you'll have
motions session, which we intend to set today least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	14	that opportunity. If you desire to make
least preliminarily. And we are going to pres forward.  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	15	additional motions on it, we are going to have a
forward.  19  20  Your motion for a continuance or your renewed  21  motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe  22  on that?	16	motions session, which we intend to set today at
Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	17	least preliminarily. And we are going to press
Your motion for a continuance or your renewed motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	18	forward.
motion is denied. All right. Anything furthe on that?	19	
on that?	20	Your motion for a continuance or your renewed
	21	motion is denied. All right. Anything further
23	22	on that?
	23	

Sir, just for clarification then. I don't think

DC:

1		I'm authorized to make a decision about voir
2		dire or not. If I decline because I right
3		now I intend to. If I just decline, I'm not
4		waiving the right for some future counsel to do
5		voir dire. Because I don't think I can even
6		say I can't say yes, I can't say no, sir.
7		
8	Presiding	Officer: Do you have any are you detailed
9		to this case, Captain Merriam?
10		
11	DC:	Sir, I am detailed to this case.
12		
13	Presiding	Officer: And you're representing Mr. Khadr?
14		
15	DC:	Yes, sir.
16		
17	Presiding	Officer: And you are qualified to do so?
18		
19	DC:	I am, sir. I read my qualifications into the
20		record.
21		
22	Presiding	Officer: All right. Then I would expect you
23		to exercise your responsibilities.

```
1
                Anything else?
2
                Sir, I may need to ask for a recess. I mean.
3
      DC:
4
      Presiding Officer: Pardon, me?
5
6
      DC:
                I may need to ask for a recess -- actually I do
7
                need to ask for a recess at this time.
8
9
      Presiding Officer: All right. How long -- how long --
10
11
                I have to consult what I believe the limits --
      DC:
12
13
      Presiding Officer: I'm sorry. How long would you like?
14
15
      DC:
                Sir, 20 minutes should do it.
16
17
      Presiding Officer: We'll be in recess then until 1630.
18
19
      The Commissions hearing recessed at 1612,
20
      11 January 2006.
21
22
23
      The Commissions hearing was called to order at 1631,
      11 January 2006.
24
```

```
1
      Presiding Officer: The Commission will come to order.
2
                All those present when we recessed are again
3
                present.
4
5
                Captain Merriam, you asked for the recess.
6
7
      DC:
               Yes, sir, I did. Thank you. Sir, I believe --
8
9
                let me back up. I represent to the court right
                now that my client has not authorized me to
10
                conduct voir dire.
11
12
      Presiding Officer: So you want to reserve voir dire,
13
                Captain Merriam? Is that what you are asking?
14
15
                I have not been authorized to --
16
      DC:
17
      Presiding Officer: Captain Merriam?
18
19
               Yes, sir.
      DC:
20
21
      Presiding Officer: Do you want to reserve voir dire?
22
23
```

DC:

Well, sir, I -- let me get to my second point

```
1
                and then I'll -- I'll let you know --
2
3
      Presiding Officer: No I don't want to get to the second
               point. I want to get to that point.
4
5
                Do you want to reserve voir dire?
6
7
      DC: I do, sir.
8
9
      Presiding Officer: All right. I will allow you to
10
                reserve voir dire.
11
12
                Anything else on the issue of voir dire?
13
14
               Yes, sir. Sir, we keep referring to this 8-5
      DC:
15
                session that happened yesterday. And I just
16
                strongly believe we've got to address that now.
17
                We've referred to it three or four times.
18
19
      Presiding Officer: You want to address it now?
20
21
               Yes, sir.
      DC:
22
23
```

Presiding Officer: All right, go ahead and address it

1		now.
2		
3	DC:	Thank you, sir. Sir, I have in my possession a
4		document that was served on me by the Assistant
5		to the Presiding Officer two days ago. The
6		document
7		
8	Presidin	g Officer: Do you want to share it with me or
9		
10	DC:	I do, sir. I'm going to introduce it as a
11		review exhibit. I will provide copies to the
12		prosecution. Do you want me to do that now,
13		sir?
14		
15	Presidin	g Officer: Please.
16		
17	DC:	The document is entitled US v Khadr
18		
19	Presidin	g Officer: Let's have it marked, please, and get
20		it to people, then you can tell us what it is.
21		
22	The docu	ment was marked.
23		
24	Presidin	g Officer: All right, I was handed it, and it is

1 marked Review Exhibit 52. Counsel want to make sure they annotate it on their copy. And what 2 about this? 3 4 DC: Sir, this document was served on me two days ago 5 by the Assistant to the Presiding Officer, 6 Mr. Hodges who -- this document purports to lay 7 out goals for the January 2006 Term in  $US\ v$ 8 9 Khadr. 10 It's got three columns. The first column says 11 "goal." The second column has "Assistant to 12 Presiding Officer Comments." And the third 13 column says, "Presiding Officer Comments," which 14 is blank. 15 16 The first thing -- and this is really the major 17 thing that I have a problem with this document 18 which is effecting my ability to continue going 19 forward at this point. The exhibit says in 20 regard to 8-5 Conferences, "As soon as the 21 22 initial session is completed, and without saying

23

24

on the record that you will have an 8-5, get

counsel into chambers." Sir, this is why I

filed a motion objecting to having to go to 8-5

Conferences. This is why the defense is so

leery of holding these off-the-record sessions

in your chambers. And, sir, we discussed -
we've discussed three times things that were

discussed two days ago in your chambers. One of

which was voir dire of the Presiding Officer,

and representations were made, I believe, in

that session that have not been made again here

in open session.

Presiding Officer: I'm sorry. Back up please. I didn't hear what you said.

DC: Sir, we discussed things in the 8-5 session that have not so far been discussed in this session.

Presiding Officer: Well, I understand that, Captain

Merriam, and that's because several times now

I've attempted to move on and you want to stop

me and take up issues that we haven't gotten

through the things that I have here before me

that I want to accomplish in terms of making the

record, to include providing reading into the

```
1
               record those things that we discussed during the
               8-2.
2
3
               8-5, yes, sir.
      DC:
4
5
      Presiding Officer: I'm sorry. 8-5.
6
7
      DC: Yes, sir.
8
9
      Presiding Officer: During that 8-5 that we discussed --
10
11
      DC: Yes, sir.
12
13
      Presiding Officer: -- and I indicated to you more than
14
               once I believe during the 8-5, if I summarized,
15
               and there was something that I omitted that you
16
               thought was necessary to be summarized for the
17
               benefit of the record, that I would give you the
18
               opportunity to do so.
19
20
      DC: Yes, sir.
21
22
      Presiding Officer: And I don't think I've done anything
23
               or indicated since that that has changed. I
24
```

also, in trying to address your concerns and lay them to rest, I indicated that I would not decide or rule on anything at an 8-5. I don't believe I have.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

The purpose of an 8-5 is to coordinate with counsel, to talk about things like scheduling, such things as the defense requiring an additional hour this afternoon to spend with their client in order to prepare for today's session, and agreeing to those types of things. Also, to try to assist counsel in resolving issues that come up where perhaps with some quidance or assistance things can be resolved short of coming in here and spending hours on the record beating each other up where we can sit down in a little less formal environment without a room full of people watching you, you can discuss or come to an agreement on them, which I think is in general a much better way to pursue things.

22

23

24

For example, the proposed trial schedule. As I indicated to you, it's better that you and the

```
1
               trial counsel get together and come to agreement
               on a proposed trial schedule, rather than me
2
                sitting up here on the bench trying to dictate
3
               what that schedule would be without any input
4
               from counsel as to what your personal schedules
5
               and commitments are. That's the purpose of the
6
                8-5. It is not to litigate things. It is not
7
               to decide issues and I don't believe that I
8
               decided or ruled on anything in there.
9
10
      DC:
               Sir, that's not what I'm saying. What I'm
11
               saying is --
12
13
      Presiding Officer: Wait, wait, wait.
14
15
      DC:
               This document says --
16
17
      Presiding Officer: Captain Merriam.
18
19
      DC: Don't go on the record --
20
21
      Presiding Officer: Captain Merriam.
22
23
             Yes, sir.
      DC:
24
```

1 **Presiding Officer:** I also indicated in that 8-2 or 8-5, 2 rather, that when I ruled on something that was 3 final. Perhaps I should have said, you don't 4 interrupt me. Is that clear? 5 6 Yes, sir. It's very clear. 7 DC: 8 Presiding Officer: All right. You've handed me RE-52. 9 Quite frankly, if I've seen this, I don't recall 10 seeing it. I'm not sure what it is or what it's 11 for. I have no idea why this would have been 12 served on anybody. It appears to be some kind 13 of an internal working document. But, again, I 14 don't know what it is or what it's for. It's 15 not something I'm using or relying on. 16 17 18 DC: Well, sir, that's -- that's what I want to discuss. Because, again, this thing lays out 19 goals for this session. It looks to me. 20 21 Presiding Officer: I'm sorry, what? 22 23

**49** 

24

DC:

This document lays out goals for this session.

That's the title of it. "Goals of the January 2006 Term." It lists goals, as if these are things that must be accomplished. It talks about holding 8-5 sessions without -- it specifically says without saying on the record you will have an 8-5, get counsel into chambers. I mean that -- that is -- that's appalling language, sir. It lists voir dire as a goal, as if there were no other alternative, as if reasons like the lack of the requested counsel were never going to be compelling ones to this session.

I don't know that that's -- your comments aren't on this document, sir. These are strictly the comments of your assistant. But it appears to be an internal document of the Commission's Office. It's filed -- I mean it's authored by the Assistant to the Presiding Officer, who works for you and for the Presiding Officer in every other case. And it appears to me that -- I mean -- what I'm trying to do is explain to you why the defense is so hesitant to go discuss things in chambers with you, because as you just

1 --

2

3 **Presiding Officer:** Captain Merriam, have I done anything in chambers that I said I would not?

5

6 DC: Not yet, sir.

7

Presiding Officer: Okay. I give you leave, Mr. Ahmad 8 leave, that if I do, then at the very next 9 session in this Commission, assuming you are 10 still present, if Mr. Ahmad is still present, 11 you may come in here and the first thing on the 12 record you are free to put that on the record 13 that I have done something in that 8-5 that I 14 said I wouldn't. And that would be to decide an 15 If we come in here and I fail to allow 16 you to fully summarize something that you think 17 needs to be made a part of the record, because 18 that is certainly appropriate, that it be 19 summarized and it reflect what we discussed if 20 counsel think appropriate. If I do that, then I 21 give you leave to raise it, to stand up before 22 we recess because it is my habit, I think, to 23 ask counsel if there's anything else that they 24

want to bring up before we recess, to raise that issue. If I don't, I give you leave to file appropriate papers. They will be marked as REs and attached to the record to protect your client's rights. All right?

DC: Sir, I guess what I'm trying to say is I think we are at that point now. Because right before -- the reason I asked for the recess, sir, is that I -- I asked you a question about what I understood to be your representation in the 8-5 session about voir dire. I asked you if I declined to do voir dire am I waiving this, because my understanding based on your conversation in the 8-5 was that you were going to allow Lieutenant Colonel Vokey or any other counsel --

Presiding Officer: Whatever your concerns are of voir dire, I thought I resolved those a moment ago.

I indicated I would allow you to reserve voir dire until you have either Colonel Vokey or whomever Mr. Khadr desires present on the case and representing him. I don't know how much

1		more I can do with that than that. Okay?
2		
3		Is there anything else I can do to relieve your
4		concerns about voir dire?
5		
6	DC:	Not voir dire specifically, sir, but about this
7		8-5 session, yes.
8		
9	Presiding	g Officer: About what?
10		
11	DC:	About the 8-5 session, sir.
12		
13	Presiding	g Officer: All right. Well I'm sorry. Go
14		ahead.
15		
16	DC:	Well, given the nature of what I think is the
17		only of this document.
18		
19	Presiding	g Officer: I cannot account for that document.
20		As I said, if I've seen it, I don't recall
21		seeing it. It is not something I prepared and
22		is certainly not something I've been using.
23		
24	DC:	Well, sir, just because I don't know what this

document is either. All I know is what it looks like.

3

4 **Presiding Officer:** Captain Merriam, let me stop you right here.

6

7 **DC:** Yes, sir.

8

Presiding Officer: There is a point in this proceeding 9 where you will be given the opportunity or 10 Colonel Vokey, whomever detailed counsel is, or 11 Mr. Ahmad will be given the opportunity to 12 present motions. Part of that motion process is 13 discovery. If you think it's important or 14 counsel representing Mr. Khadr believe it's 15 important, I give you leave to make it the 16 subject of an appropriate motion. I'm not 17 ruling on any motions. I'm not indicating 18 whether I would grant a discovery request 19 20 concerning that or allow someone to testify concerning that or anything else. I give you 21 leave to raise it and I think the appropriate 22 place to do that would be in a motions session, 23 not here and not now, because as you just said, 24

1		you don't know.
2		
3	DC:	Right, sir.
4		
5	Presid	ing Officer: Trial counsel doesn't know. Quite
6		frankly, I don't know.
7		
8	DC:	Sir, can I ask that is not what I intend to
9		ask for. I understand. I think you are exactly
10		right about that. We don't know what this is.
11		
12	Presid	ing Officer: Slow down, please.
13		
14	DC:	But I would like to ask
15		
16	Presid	ing Officer: Slow down, please.
17		
18	DC:	Yes, sir. I'd like to ask you for an order
19		reserving the opportunity to voir dire the
20		Assistant to the Presiding Officer at the
21		appropriate time, and preserving all
22		communications to the Assistant Presiding
23		Officer, and the Presiding Officer, and any
24		other Presiding Officer or other Commission

1		officials.
2		
3	Presidin	g Officer: No.
4		
5	DC:	I need to have this preserved, sir. This is
6		this is what appears to be an internal document
7		authored by the Assistant to the Presiding
8		Officer.
9		
10	Presidin	g Officer: Slow down.
11		
12	DC:	Which raises serious concerns about the openness
13		and fairness of the proceeding I've got to
14		have that I've got to have this and other
15		internal documents that the Assistant to the
16		Presiding Officer is involved in preserved.
17		
18	Presidin	g Officer: I am not going to issue such an
19		order, and I am not at this point going to allow
20		you to voir dire the Assistant to the Presiding
21		Officer. As I said, there will be a time and a
22		place for that, and you can make that motion or
23		your successor or Mr. Ahmad may make that

motion.

1		
2	DC:	Very well, sir.
3		
4	Presiding	officer: Trial counsel or, excuse me,
5		prosecutor at this point I want to open up the
6		opportunity for you to conduct voir dire, but
7		since I've given the defense the opportunity to
8		reserve that, would you like to reserve that as
9		well?
10		
11	APROS:	Sir, if I may, we would like we are prepared
12		to conduct voir dire and would like to do that.
13		
14	Presiding	officer: You may proceed if you would like to.
15		
16	APROS:	Yes, sir. Due to the defense reserving for
17		procedural aspects, I'd like to respectfully
18		request this permission.
19		
20	Presiding	officer: I need you to speak up. I'm having
21		trouble hearing you.
22		
23	APROS:	I apologize, sir. At the next session, we would

like to reserve the right to ask follow-on  $% \left\{ 1\right\} =\left\{ 1\right\}$ 

1		questions after defense does their voir dire,
2		should it be necessary.
3		
4	Presiding	g Officer: All right.
5		
6	APROS:	Also, should something between this session and
7		the next session, a new fact that was not known
8		come up requesting the need for voir dire, we'd
9		just like permission to ask new questions on new
10		facts. That's something that will probably
11		happen anytime in the trial anyway, but
12		
13	Presiding	g Officer: All right. I'll allow you to do
14		that.
15		
16	DC:	Sir, the defense objects to that. I mean if we
17		are going to reserve voir dire, let's just
18		reserve it and let's just all do it at the same
19		time.
20		
21	Presiding	g Officer: Denied. Sit down, please. And I
22		would note for the record I've provided a
23		summarized biography of myself along with
24		response to defense questions and they are

1		marked as RE 18 and 29.
2		
3		In addition, as I mentioned before, I do know
4		Lieutenant Colonel Vokey professionally and I
5		think he is a highly qualified and competent
6		both officer and attorney. Lieutenant?
7		
8	APROS:	Thank you, sir. In regards to the 30
9		December 2005 questions that you answered from
10		the defense, you had indicated that you had no
11		prior
12		
13	Presiding	g Officer: Give me just a minute to bring that
14		up.
15		
16	APROS:	Yes, sir.
17		
18	Presiding	officer: All right. I have it in front of me
19		What specific question are you referring to?
20		
21	APROS:	Sir, on Page 3 of that document, question six.
22		
23	Presiding	officer: Yes.

1	PROS:	You indicate that you had no prior knowledge of
2		the facts of this case.
3		
4	Presidin	g Officer: That's correct.
5		
6	PROS:	Since that time to now, sir, do you have any
7		knowledge of the facts of this case?
8		
9	Presidin	g Officer: No.
10		
11	APROS:	Outside
12		
13	Presidin	g Officer: I've seen the charge sheet. That's
14		all I've seen.
15		
16	APROS:	Correct, sir. Outside of what has already been
17		filed in this case?
18		
19	Presidin	g Officer: No.
20		
21	APROS:	Sir, have you in any way read or been exposed to
22		any type of media reports; TV documentaries,
23		press conferences or press reports regarding the
24		accused's family?

1 Presiding Officer: I think I've seen something that said 2 his father was killed, I believe in Pakistan. 3 And he has a -- his father immigrated and I 4 don't recall from where to Canada, where he was 5 either born or raised with several brothers and 6 sisters. Again, I don't recall the number. And 7 at some point they moved from Canada, and I 8 don't recall if it was Afghanistan or Pakistan. 9 I want to say Pakistan, and it seemed like they 10 moved back to Canada and then back to 11 Afghanistan or Pakistan. They moved back and 12 forth between Afghanistan and Pakistan. 13 14 APROS: Sir, will that prior knowledge of those facts in 15 any way impact on your ability to be impartial 16 to this accused and to ensure that he receives a 17 full and fair trial at all times? 18 19 Presiding Officer: 20 No. 21 Will that in any way play an impact in any 22 APROS:

to a legal motion in this case?

23

24

factual decision you may have to make predicate

1		
2	Presiding	g Officer: No.
3		
4	APROS:	Sir, have you read or been made aware of any
5		type
6		
7	Presiding	g Officer: Wait. Let me back up for a minute.
8		When I say his father was killed in and,
9		again, I think it was Pakistan, the articles
10		that I had seen also indicated he was somehow
11		associated or friends with Osama bin Laden, was
12		involved in al Qaida. But I don't know the
13		specifics of it.
14		
15	APROS:	Again, sir, would that have any impact?
16		
17	Presiding	g Officer: It does not impact me at all. I
18		intend to decide the issues that are presented
19		here in court based on the evidence presented
20		and the law as I understand it.
21		
22	APROS:	Just to carry on with that, sir, with the news
23		reports, press articles or any of the same, have
24		you learned any knowledge about the al Qaida

1		terrorist organization?
2		
3	Presidin	g Officer: Well, sure. I think I indicated in
4		my I don't recall if it was the biography or
5		the questionnaire that at one point I served as
6		the Staff Judge Advocate for I Marine
7		Expeditionary Force. And during the time we
8		received briefings on what was going on,
9		intelligence briefings. And I recall nothing
10		specific about those, and I wouldn't reveal it
11		here in court anyway because it may be
12		classified. I'm not sufficient.
13		
14	APROS:	No, I understand, sir.
15		
16	Presidin	g Officer: But there's nothing about that that I
17		recall specifically and certainly nothing that I
18		can think of that would impact me here.
19		
20	APROS:	Sir, if throughout this trial you somehow do
21		recall, for whatever reason, something you have
22		heard in these briefings or from a press report,
23		and you feel it may impact your ability to be
24		impartial or it may impact your ability to

1		ensure the accused receives a full and fair
2		trial, how will you handle that?
3		
4	Presidin	g Officer: I would inform counsel, allow them
5		the opportunity to inquire and exercise a
6		challenge, if they determined it was
7		appropriate. If I felt it was somehow
8		disqualifying, I would disqualify myself and
9		recuse myself and ask that a new Presiding
10		Officer be detailed. Let me also say that when
11		I say, "intelligence briefings" as best I recall
12		they were things that dealt with the historical
13		background of Afghanistan and Pakistan, the
14		tribes and the relationships and some of the
15		cultural type things. I don't recall anything
16		specifically on any particular organization or
17		individual.
18		
19	APROS:	But it is safe to say, sir, that counsel can
20		trust that if you believe an issue comes up you
21		will address it.
22		
23	Presidin	g Officer: Certainly. That's my responsibility
24		and my oath.

APROS: Yes, sir. Sir, in your questionnaire you had
mentioned that you had occasion to try cases
that dealt with the Geneva Conventions or
possibly international law that you've had some
sort of dealings with the law of armed conflict.

7

8

Presiding Officer: Correct.

9

10 APROS: Obviously, during that time, sir, you've

11 probably looked at treatises, maybe law review

12 articles, certain types of legal authority. If

13 I may, will that prohibit you from coming to any

14 legal motion filed by either party with an open

15 mind?

16

17 Presiding Officer: No. The cases that I tried, there were two of them as I recall, and they dealt 18 with abuse of Iraqi detainees by Americans, 19 actually Marines -- actually they dealt with the 20 Geneva Conventions. And the issue turned on 21 whether or not there was a duty by U.S. Marines 22 to protect individuals who came into their care, 23 whether they be POWs or detainees or however you 24

1 want to characterize them. And it was litigated and I ruled. The cases were tried. 2 both individuals were -- they were convicted of 3 some of the charges, acquitted of not all of the 4 charges. They were involved in OIF-I, Operation 5 Iraqi Freedom One. I think the Convening 6 Authority has still not acted on those cases. 7 It was -- I intend to decide the issues 8 presented here in this Commission based on the 9 law as I understand it.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

10

Commission law, the term we've used to try to capture things such as the Presiding Officer Memorandums, the President's Order, Military Commission Orders. When deciding an issue, I think it's appropriate to read counsel's briefs and I depend heavily on counsel to educate me as to what they believe the law is. And then I intend to do my own research and make my ruling. And when I make such a ruling, I will inform counsel of the law that I am following. And if counsel think it appropriate or desire that I provide additional indication of what law I've applied, I can certainly allow them to ask for

T believe

1 that. 2 Sir, for your duties here as Presiding Officer, 3 APROS: does anybody write a fitness report or any kind 4 of evaluation on you? 5 6 Presiding Officer: 7 8 APROS: As a follow on, is there any type of evaluation 9 that's going to be made of you for purposes of a 10 promotion board, sir? 11 12 Presiding Officer: No. I was due to retire, and I 13 explained this to counsel. I was due to retire. 14 It was actually effective 1 April, but I was 15 going to go on terminal leave, until I was 16 detailed to this Commission. I'm at my career 17 maximum. I'm not going to be promoted. I'm not 18 looking to be promoted. I am a Colonel of 19 Marines and I will retire a Colonel of Marines. 20 21 Sir, from the time of your consideration for APROS: 22 being a Presiding Officer. 23

Presiding Officer: What does that mean?

2

1

APROS: When you were first notified that you were being considered for the position of Presiding

Officer.

6

7 Presiding Officer: No. I was never notified I was being considered for the position. I was asked. And 8 I don't recall when the first time, whether I 9 was interested in it because the Marine Corps, 10 and I think all of the services were tasked to 11 provide five nominees to be Presiding Officers. 12 We were tasked to provide a data sheet which was 13 brief beyond description. I think I still have 14 a copy of the second one. I don't know if I 15 have a copy of the first one, a data sheet to 16 Headquarters Marine Corps, which I think was 17 then forwarded up to OMC. I'm speculating on 18 I believe it was. 19

20

21

22

23

24

At some point they were -- the services I believe were asked to renew or validate those nominations and I was asked to update or validate that my data sheet was current or

correct, which I did, just before submitting.

And I think it was after *Hamden* was decided by the Circuit Court of Appeals.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

I asked the Deputy Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps whether or not there was a possibility I would be selected for this. I was told, probably not, simply because, I think, he didn't think it was going -- he wasn't sure that anything was going to happen at any time in the near future. And I don't know that he was speaking from a position of particular information, but I asked him if there was a possibility. Based on that, I submitted my retirement letter. I asked to go ahead and retire effective 1 April. And then the next thing I heard on it was I received a call from I believe he's the Chief of Staff for the Commissions, indicating I had been selected. But I don't think Mr. Altenberg had signed the paperwork or signed the letter appointing me, detailing me. And we discussed the issue of my pending retirement. He discussed that with Mr. Altenberg and indicated

if I was willing to continue on active duty even past my retirement date that that would not be a problem. And then I received -- later I received a letter in the mail. But there wasn't a period where I was told I'm being considered for this. It was just a phone call saying that I had been selected.

APROS: Well, sir, from the phone call, from that time, sir, has anyone ever come up to you in any way and discussed a certain outcome is desired in this Commission?

Presiding Officer: I'm not sure what you mean by outcome desired. Nobody has ever told me that they're looking -- first of all, I've never discussed U.S. versus Khadr with anybody. The facts -- I don't know any of the facts of U.S. versus I don't know what that evidence is. Khadr. don't know what the witnesses are and nobody has hinted, indicated, tapped the floor or anything else that they want a certain result. Were they to do something like that, depending on who they were, and when I say that, who I'd report it to, 

I would probably put them on report.

2

1

The only guidance I have, if you will, is what 3 the President said. He wants a full and fair 4 trial. And that is what I intend to see, is a 5 full and fair trial. And I have no desire, I 6 don't want, wouldn't like, or anything else to 7 see a particular outcome other than that--8 whether Mr. Khadr is convicted of anything or not will be up to the Commission. What I want 10 to see when I walk out of here is that he has 11 gotten that full and fair hearing and that 12 people realize he received that full and fair 13 hearing, to include Mr. Khadr. 14

15

APROS: Sir, would it be appropriate to say that you

personally as you sit there today as our

Presiding Officer, that you feel completely free

and independent to ensure that the accused

receives a fair, full and fair and impartial

trial?

22

23

Presiding Officer: Yes.

1	APROS:	Two final questions, sir.
2		
3		Is there anything in your background, whether it
4		be personal or professional, that you feel could
5		impact on your ability to give this, the
6		accused, a full and fair trial and to be
7		impartial?
8		
9	Presidin	g Officer: No.
10		
11	APROS:	Last question, sir.
12		
13		Should anything come up that would in any way
14		prohibit you, prevent you, or unlawfully
15		influence you in being fair, full and fair trial
16		and being impartial, how will you handle that?
17		
18	Presidin	g Officer: Ask your question again.
19		
20	APROS:	Yes, sir. I'm sorry it did come out a little
21		convoluted.
22		
23		Should anything come up, whether it be in your
24		nergonal or professional background that you

1 remember, or should anything come up through any kind of unlawful influence that would effect 2 your ability, continued ability, to be impartial 3 to the accused and to ensure that he receives a 4 full and fair trial, I'm asking you: How would 5 you handle that situation, sir? 6 7 Presiding Officer: As I said earlier, if something I 8 recalled, I thought impacted on that, I would 9 notify counsel of that. And I quite frankly 10 can't conceive, short of a death threat, what 11 12 could influence me to throw the case, if you will. 13 14 Now, if any government official purports to APROS: 15 call you and say --16 17 Presiding Officer: I don't mean to be flippant about it, 18 but they can't shave my head and send me to 19 Okinawa anymore. As I said, I'm going to retire 20 1 July. I'm not promotable. I'm not going to 21 get promoted. I will retire a Colonel of 22

Marines. My retirement pay is fixed.

nothing that anyone can do to my career or

23

1		otherwise to influence that. Were someone to do
2		that, aside from me reporting it to whoever
3		their boss was or to the Appointing Authority, I
4		would obviously also make counsel aware of that
5		so you could all take whatever action you
6		thought was appropriate, either in the way of
7		voir dire or challenges or whatever you thought
8		was appropriate.
9		
10	APROS:	Sir, I thank you for answering those questions.
11		
12	Presidin	g Officer: Captain Merriam, I know you want to
13		reserve voir dire.
14		
15		Do you want to ask any questions at this point?
16		
17	DC:	No, sir.
18		
19	Presidin	g Officer: All right. Government, do you desire
20		to exercise a challenge?
21		
22	APROS:	No, Your Honor, we do not.
23		
24	Presidin	g Officer: Captain Merriam, do you want to

1		reserve challenges until such time as you've
2		exercised voir dire?
3		
4	DC:	Yes, sir.
5		
6	Presidin	g Officer: All right. I'll permit you to do so
7		
8		It appears at this point all the do you need
9		a moment?
10		
11	CDC:	No, sir, I was just was trying to
12		
13	Presidin	g Officer: No, that's fine. If you need to
14		explain something to him and you need a moment,
15		I'll wait.
16		
17	CDC:	Thank you. I appreciate the time you are
18		affording. I was able to explain that to him.
19		
20	Presidin	g Officer: I'm sorry?
21		
22	CDC:	He just had a he asked a clarifying question
23		about the last colloquy, and I was just trying
24		to clarify that for him.

1		
2	Presiding	officer: All right, if and like I said, if
3		you need a moment to explain something before I
4		go on, please just hold your hand up or
5		something. All right?
6		
7	CDC:	Thank you. I appreciate that.
8		
9	Presiding	officer: It appears that all the persons
10		before the Commissions have the requisite
11		qualifications and have been sworn.
12		
13		Defense counsel, trial counsel [Prosecutor] has
14		indicated you've received a copy of the charge
15		sheet. I don't believe he indicated you
16		received a copy of the Arabic translation, but I
17		do believe that's the case.
18		
19		Is that not the case?
20		
21	DC:	Sir, we have and, for the record, he did
22		indicate that earlier, so we do have it.
23		

Presiding Officer: All right. Prosecutor, do you want

1		to state for the record or, excuse me. Will you
2		state for the record the general nature of the
3		charges, please.
4		
5	PROS:	Yes, sir.
6		
7	Presiding	g Officer: The general nature of the charges in
8		this case are:
9		
10	Charge I	Conspiracy to attack civilians, to attack
11		civilian objects, to commit murder by an
12		unprivileged belligerent, to commit the offense
13		of the destruction of property by an
14		unprivileged belligerent, and to commit
15		terrorism.
16		
17	Charge II	: Murder by an unprivileged belligerent.
18		
19	Charge II	II: Attempted murder by an unprivileged
20		belligerent.
21		
22	And Charg	ge IV: Aiding the enemy.
23		

Presiding Officer: Defense, do you desire that the

```
1
                charges be read?
2
      DC:
                No, sir, we waive reading.
3
4
      Presiding Officer: The reading will be omitted.
5
6
                Do all counsel understand the provisions of the
7
                Military Commission Order Number 1 governing
8
                protected information? Prosecution?
9
10
               Yes, sir.
      PROS:
11
12
      Presiding Officer: Defense?
13
14
      DC: No, sir.
15
16
               Excuse me, sir.
17
      CDC:
18
      Presiding Officer: I'm sorry.
19
20
      CDC:
                Can we just have a minute?
21
22
      Presiding Officer: You may.
23
```

1	CDC:	Thank you.
2		
3	The civi	lian counsel conferred with the accused.
4		
5	CDC:	Thank you, Your Honor.
6		
7	Presidin	g Officer: Do counsel also understand that they
8		have a continuing obligation to, as soon as
9		practical, notify me of any intent to offer
10		evidence involving protected information, so
11		that I may consider the need to close the
12		proceedings. Prosecution?
13		
14	PROS:	Yes, sir.
15		
16	Presidin	g Officer: Defense?
17		
18	DC:	Yes, sir.
19		
20	Presidin	g Officer: The prosecution has proposed three
21		protective orders. And during both the first
22		and the second 8-5, we discussed those, and I
23		know there was an exchange of e-mail. And I
24		believe we reached agreement on the first two,

probably the third one, and I have signed the
first two protective orders. And defense, you
specifically agreed to the language in those
first two protective orders. Is that correct?

5

6 **DC:** That's correct, sir.

7

8 **Presiding Officer:** I believe those are marked as RE-45 9 and 46.

10

The third protective order, I think there is 11 still some discussion, and it's my intent that 12 once we conclude here we will finish 13 wordsmithing that, assuming there is no issue 14 from either side and I will sign that. It will 15 be marked as an RE and appropriately issued. 16 there is an issue, and by that I mean either 17 side contest the language in that protective 18 order, then we will reconvene before we leave 19 the island this week and we will litigate that 20 and I will resolve that and then issue that 21 order. 22

23

24

Any objection to that procedure?

1 No, sir. 2 PROS: 3 No, sir. DC: 4 5 Presiding Officer: I'm required by Military Commission 6 Order Number One to consider the safety of the 7 witnesses and others--during these proceedings. 8 I remind counsel they must notify me of the 9 issues regarding safety of potential witnesses, 10 so that I might direct the appropriate methods 11 in which to present that testimony and ensure 12 the security of all the parties and the 13 witnesses. 14 15 Is either side aware of any other protective 16 orders that have been issued other than the two 17 that I've signed? 18 19 20 Prosecutor? 21 No, sir. 22 PROS: 23

Presiding Officer: Defense.

1		
2	DC:	No, sir.
3		
4	Presiding	g Officer: Does either side request any
5		additional protective orders other than the two
6		I've signed as well as the third one which I
7		intend to sign once we've worked out the exact
8		language?
9		
10		Prosecutor?
11		
12	PROS:	No, sir.
13		
14	Presiding	g Officer: Defense?
15		
16	DC:	No, sir.
17		
18	Presiding	g Officer: All of the Presiding Officer
19		Memorandums which have been issued so far to
20		this date remain in effect and I believe they
21		are marked as a review exhibit. That would be
22		Review Exhibit 44. And defense, you've
23		indicated you have copies of all of those POMs,
24		is that also correct?

1 DC: That is correct, sir. 2 3 Presiding Officer: The current filings inventory, which 4 is marked as Review Exhibit 43 has been attached 5 6 to the record, and I believe counsel also have a 7 copy of that; is that also correct? 8 Yes, sir. 9 DC: 10

Presiding Officer: Defense?

13 DC: Yes, sir.

12

14

Presiding Officer: And I just remind counsel that that 15 filings inventory is particularly important, as 16 it is our -- particularly my guide as to what's 17 before the Commission, in terms of motions that 18 need to be litigated and issues that need to be 19 resolved. If it is not accurate, it is your 20 21 responsibility to review it and ensure that it is accurate. If you note a deficiency, it's 22 your responsibility to advise either myself or 23 the assistant to the Presiding Officer at your 24

```
1
                earliest opportunity so we might take care of
                that.
2
3
                Defense counsel, it's your desire to reserve
4
                motions?
5
6
               It is, sir.
7
      DC:
8
      Presiding Officer: Go ahead and take a moment to talk
                with --
10
11
                One, moment, thank you.
12
      DC:
13
      Defense counsel conferred.
14
15
                Sir, my co-counsel informs me he does want to
      DC:
16
                make one motion at this time, but it's our
17
                intent to reserve motions for a later date.
18
                It's particularly relevant to the current
19
                session and to events that are happening in
20
                relation to that session, but I should let him
21
                speak for himself in that regard.
22
23
      Presiding Officer: All right. Mr. Ahmad?
```

2 **CDC:** Sir, I know from our 8-5 session yesterday that you prefer --

4

5 Presiding Officer: I need you to please speak up.

6

7 **CDC:** Sure.

8

9 **Presiding Officer:** It's not only for my benefit and the
10 court reporter, but I've been told that the
11 people that are sitting somewhere outside this
12 room that are watching these proceedings are
13 having a very difficult time hearing.

14

I understand, sir. I'll do my best to raise my CDC: 15 I know from our 8-5 session voice a bit. 16 yesterday that you prefer motions to be put in 17 writing and I would prefer to be able to give 18 you this motion in writing. Because of the time 19 circumstances to which it relates, that's not 20 possible, and so I'd like the opportunity to 21 make this motion orally. If you don't rule on 22 it, I would be more than happy to reduce it to 23 writing for consideration thereafter. I can 24

tell you what the motion relates to. Is what

I'd like to do is --

3

4 Presiding Officer: Well, why don't you make the motion.

I'll tell you whether I'll rule on it -
depending on what it is, I'll rule on it now or

defer it until we have a motion session.

8

All right. Sir, this motion that I'd like to 9 CDC: make now relates to the making of inappropriate 10 prejudicial extrajudicial statements by the 11 prosecution. This is based on statements that 12 were made at a press conference that was held --13 sponsored by the Defense Department yesterday. 14 And it's made in light of the fact that 15 immediately after this session there is 16 scheduled another press conference at which, my 17 understanding is, the prosecution will be 18 19 available. The reason I am making this motion, sir, is that I was -- I both was in attendance 20 at the press conference yesterday and heard 21 statements from the Chief Prosecutor in this 22 office, I believe is Colonel Morris Davis. And 23 I've seen reports of those comments in various 24

1 media outlets in the papers today. Those comments, sir, in my view, are in violation of 2 the Colonel's ethical obligations under the 3 Armed Forces Rules of Professional Conduct as 4 well as under the Rules of Professional Conduct 5 of the jurisdictions in which he practices or he 6 is licensed. 7 8 Specifically, sir, there are two rules. One of 9 which exists in all three of the bodies of 10 professional conduct to which I'm referring. 11 It's Rule 3.6, in the Air Force rules, also Rule 12 3.6, in the rules of professional conduct by the 13 District of Columbia, where it's my 14 understanding that the Chief Prosecutor is 15 licensed; and Rule 3.6 of the Rules of 16 professional conduct for the state of North 17 Carolina. 18 19 Presiding Officer: Okay. Let me stop you for just a 20 minute. 21

22

23 CDC: Sure.

1	Presiding	officer: What is the relief you are seeking at
2		this point?
3		
4	CDC:	Sir, the relief I'm seeking is in two forms.
5		
6		First, I'm asking for an instruction to the
7		prosecution to refrain from making statements
8		that are in violation of either Rule 3.6 of
9		those three bodies of Rules of Professional
10		Conduct, as I just mentioned, as well as Rule
11		3.8 of the Rules of Professional Conduct of the
12		District of Columbia and North Carolina.
13		
14		If I can just say briefly, sir, that Rule 3.6
15		relates to trial publicity and Rule 3.8 relates
16		to special it's titled "Special
17		Responsibilities of a Prosecutor," that's the
18		title in North Carolina's rules. There is a
19		comparable title in the District of Columbia.
20		Both of those rules are based upon the American
21		Bar Association's Model Rules of Professional
22		Conduct.
23		
24		So the first form of relief I'm seeking is an

1		instruction to the prosecution, then, to refrain
2		from making extra-judicial statements in
3		violation of those rules.
4		
5		The second form of relief I'm seeking, sir, is
6		an order to the prosecution to take steps to
7		remediate those statements that were made
8		yesterday.
9		
10	Presidin	g Officer: Hold on just a minute.
11		
12	CDC:	Yes, sir.
13		
14	Presidin	g Officer: So you are asking for a ruling for
15		me, an order from me directing the prosecution
16		to refrain from making extra-judicial
17		statements?
18		
19	CDC:	In violation of the specific rules.
20		
21	Presidin	g Officer: Right.
22		
23	CDC:	That's the first form of relief.

1	Presiding	g Officer: The second relief?
2		
3	CDC:	The second form of relief I'm seeking, sir, is
4		an instruction to the prosecution to take steps
5		to remediate for the comments that were made
6		yesterday in violation of those rules.
7		
8		If I may, sir?
9		
10	Presiding	g Officer: Just a minute.
11		
12	CDC:	Sure.
13		
14	Presiding	g Officer: All right. Please go ahead.
15		
16	CDC:	The remediation I think could take several
17		different forms. This is with respect to the
18		second form of relief I'm seeking. I think it
19		could be remediated in several ways.
20		
21		I would suggest the most appropriate way to
22		achieve that remediation would be for the Chief
23		Prosecutor to retract those statements he made
24		yesterday with respect to my client, Omar Khadr,

because they were unduly prejudicial. They were 1 in violation of the rules governing this 2 prosecutor, because he does have special 3 responsibilities under the bodies of 4 professional responsibility I've cited, and 5 because he has special responsibilities with 6 regard to pretrial publicity. That's the form 7 of remediation that I think is most appropriate. 8 I would be open to considering others that you, sir, think would be appropriate. 10 11 However, my bottom line is that I think some 12 form of remediation is necessary in light of the 13 statements that were made yesterday. 14 15 Presiding Officer: Do you have -- quite frankly, I've 16 been a little busy the last couple days. I 17 haven't been watching the press. Do you have 18 copies of these statements he made or a 19 transcript of the press conference? 20 21 Sir, what I have, and I understand that you've 22 CDC: been busy and that's why I don't have a written 23

motion for you. What I have --

1		
2	Presiding	officer: Because I've been busy or because
3		you've been busy?
4		
5	CDC:	Well, because you've been busy and I've been
6		busy too. And those two things aren't
7		unconnected.
8		
9	Presiding	g Officer: I think you're right.
10		
11	CDC:	What I have in front of me are copies of various
12		newspaper articles that quote from the Chief
13		Prosecutor. What I would like to do is to
14		briefly give three examples of statements that
15		are reflected in those in those that I heard
16		myself.
17		
18	Presiding	g Officer: I think I'm not going to let you do
19		that. What I would ask: Do you have multiple
20		copies or just a single copy?
21		
22	CDC:	Sir, I do not have multiple copies. I certainly
23		can arrange to have those. I do think it's
24		important, however, in order for you to make a

threshold determination of whether to rule upon
this to have some sense of what the nature of
the comments were.

Presiding Officer: Well, so do I, that's why I was asking if you had copies of the articles. Quite frankly, I don't want to -- whether I'm inclined to rule or not, I'm not going to rule based on just a snippet here or there being read into the record. What I want to see at a minimum would be the articles that you are referring to in their entirety.

CDC: Absolutely.

Presiding Officer: And I would like a copy of those.

Perhaps the bailiff -- I'm not sure how much longer we'll be here, but while we are talking perhaps the bailiff can take those and make copies for myself, trial counsel -- excuse me, prosecutor, and a copy for the record, and then we can have those marked as an exhibit. If it's going to take longer than that or you don't have much else to say until I've read them, then

maybe we should just take a short recess to do
that. That would also give everybody a chance
to read them. In fact, as I say that, I think
that's what I intend to do. But before we do
that, do you have copies of the particular rules
that you are referring to that you believe are
applicable to Colonel Davis?

CDC: I do, sir. Perhaps what I could do if we are going to take a recess, I could within about ten minutes prepare a packet that has -- and I again I apologize for not having this --

Presiding Officer: No, sir. Don't apologize.

CDC: -- before we came in the door.

Presiding Officer: That's fine.

20 CDC: But I can prepare the news articles to which I
21 am referring and copies of what I believe to be
22 the applicable rules and make those available to
23 the prosecution and, of course, to you, sir.

Presiding Officer: All right. Okay. I think that would be appropriate at this point. Trial counsel or prosecutor rather, do you have anything you want to -- any comment you want to make before we take a recess?

6

1

2

3

4

5

Sir, I would just ask that this motion be 7 PROS: reduced to written form and we have time to 8 respond appropriately. Colonel Davis is 9 certainly aware of his ethical obligations and 10 responsibilities and certainly in light of the 11 fact that the defense has raised it in this 12 case, any further comments that he would have, 13 I'm sure would be well within his ethical 14 responsibilities. He would keep them in mind. 15 So I don't think any order from the Presiding 16 Officer would be necessary. 17

18

19

Presiding Officer: Comments, Mr. Ahmad?

20

21 CDC: Yes, sir. In principle I agree with the
22 prosecution that it would be better to reduce
23 this to writing. That would provide me the
24 opportunity to direct the Commission to relevant

1		case law beyond just the rules, which I think
2		would be quite favorable to the position that
3		I'm advocating.
4		
5	Presidin	g Officer: Well, it certainly would be helpful.
6		
7	CDC:	And I I can I can provide I did not
8		mention this earlier, I can provide both the
9		prosecution and the Commission with at least one
10		case that I think is relevant here.
11		
12		The larger point, however, is that though I
13		agree with the prosecution in principle that it
14		would be better, and that's I believe why you
15		have expressed your preference that things be
16		put in writing rather than made orally. The
17		fact that there is now another press conference
18		that's been scheduled
19		
20	Presidin	g Officer: Well, I understand that. I don't
21		want to beat that part to death.
22		
23	CDC:	Okay. I would just if I could just in
24		response in to what the Major has said, I don't,

respectfully, I don't make this motion lightly.

And respectfully, I don't believe that

self-policing by the prosecution, in light of

this motion, is sufficient. And that is what I

heard in the statement that was made by the

Major.

Presiding Officer: I think that's what he said.

CDC: And I disagree with that.

Presiding Officer: Okay. Let's do this. Let's take a recess. We are not in recess yet until I drop the gavel, so everybody just sit still. That's why I use the gavel so everybody knows when we are either on the record or off.

We are going to take a recess, make copies, put them together. Please provide a copy to the government counsel, provide a copy to me. If you would, also provide a copy to the court reporter and she will mark that as the RE. And then when everybody is ready, after we've had a chance to read it, please let the bailiff know.

1	Ι	He'll get everybody back together and we'll
2	1	reassemble.
3		
4	I	Do you want your client, Mr. Khadr, to remain in
5	1	here, or do you want him to be taken back to his
6	ć	area?
7		
8	CDC:	Sir, we'd prefer that he remain here.
9		
10	Presiding	Officer: All right. We are in recess.
11		
12	The Commis	ssion hearing recessed at 1722, 11 January 2006.
13		
14	The Commis	ssion hearing was called to order at 1810,
15	11 January	7 2006.
16		
17	Presiding	Officer: The hearing will come to order. All
18	1	those present when we recessed are again
19	I	present.
20		
21	1	Mr. Ahmad, I read through your partially
22	1	through your package. I'll be honest, I didn't
23	]	read it all. A half an inch of material here,
24	ć	and it's after 1800. And I'm not going to read

1		it all tonight. I did read the one or two
2		Articles that seemed to contain some information
3		or excerpts from Colonel Davis' interviews with
4		the press. They also indicate as I read them
5		that you have also had some interviews with the
6		press; is that correct?
7		
8	CDC:	Yes, it is. I was
9		
10	Presiding	g Officer: I'm sorry. Please speak up.
11		
12	CDC:	Yes, sir, it is. I was a participant in the
13		same press conference yesterday.
14		
15	Presiding	g Officer: All right. As I understand your
16		motion, you want me to order Colonel Davis and
17		other members of the prosecution to comply with
18		their ethical responsibilities; is that correct?
19		
20	CDC:	Sir, I would like you to instruct the
21		prosecution to I'm not sure that you can
22		order Colonel Davis to. I don't think that he's
23		entered an appearance here. I would note,
24		however, that

Presiding Officer: Well, I think -- I think that I can

do what I believe is necessary. And the actions

of Colonel Davis as the Chief Prosecutor would

be something I can take into account if later on

I decided that some type of corrective action

were required.

CDC: Yes, sir.

Presiding Officer: So the fact that he has not made an appearance here is of no particular moment to me at this point. I also think that members of the U.S. military, when they are told to do something will do it, particularly if they are the Chief Prosecutor and they think it will adversely impact a case that they are responsible to see to the prosecution of. 

Quite frankly, I think that were I to order something, the Appointing Authority would do one of two things; tell me, No, he's not going to do it, or make it happen. If he tells me he's not going to do it, obviously, we could take that up

here in court, but it wouldn't be ignored. guess, is what I'm saying. 2 3 I understand what you are saying, sir, and I CDC: 4 quess in an abundance of caution I was saying 5 that I didn't know the answer to that question. 6 What I wanted to volunteer, I certainly don't 7 disagree with anything that you have said, but 8 in addition to that, what I would suggest is 9 that Rule 3.8 of both the DC rules and the Rules 10 of North Carolina extend not only to the 11 prosecutor who is before you, but those who are 12 associated with him or her. So I do think that 13 the applicable rules do allow you that reach in 14 addition to what you said. 15 16 Presiding Officer: I don't think the extent of my reach 17 is really at issue here. 18 19 CDC: Okay. 20 21 Presiding Officer: So I think we are in agreement. 22 23 Yes, sir. 24 CDC:

2

3

4

6

7

Presiding Officer: At this point I am not prepared to rule on your motion. What I am prepared to do is hold a hearing tomorrow, in which I will give counsel time to brief the issue and provide additional exhibits for both sides, because I think it's an important issue.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I would note for the benefit of the parties and just remind them, and I believe the defense you do have copies of these, that back on 1 December of 2005 shortly after I was appointed to this Commission I provided to the members of the Commission a letter of instruction, which specifically told them to avoid any news accounts of this or any other Commission proceedings, just to protect Mr. Khadr's rights for a fair trial. That was put out, not at the request of the prosecution and not at the request of the government, but it was put out at my direction to ensure that Mr. Khadr gets his fair and full trial by a panel that's free from the effects of pretrial publicity.

It's also, I think, part of the process or will be part of the process that counsel will be given the opportunity to voir dire all of the members. Quite frankly, given the amount of publicity that this case and the case just immediately proceeded us here are receiving, and will receive, I would anticipate some extensive voir dire from both the government and from the defense on that issue, which is why I put out the instruction to the members to avoid any press accounts that might occur.

And that specifically alluded to surfing the internet where they might get on CNN or Fox news or any one of the other multitude of websites that may carry information concerning these proceedings; as well as watching news accounts on the TV and reading things in magazines or other periodicals.

And I believe that's a fairly effective prophylactic that's already in place to protect Mr. Khadr's rights. There's also a provision in the MCI, both 3 and 4 that require both the

1		prosecution and the defense to receive
2		permission before they engage in such press
3		conferences.
4		
5		Do you know, Major, if the government has
6		complied with that?
7		
8	PROS:	To my knowledge, sir, Colonel Davis did receive
9		permission to speak with the media.
10		
11	Presidin	g Officer: All right. And, Mr. Ahmad, have you
12		received such permission?
13		
14	CDC:	Yes, sir, I have.
15		
16	Presidin	g Officer: What I would ask both sides to do is
17		between now and tomorrow get a copy of that
18		permission and provide it to Mr. Hodges so it
19		can be made a review exhibit. I will also, at
20		this time, ask excuse me, no, I don't ask.
21		I'm directing the Prosecutor to convey to
22		Colonel Davis my concerns and the defense's
23		concerns and ask that he consider those before
24		engaging in any additional press conferences.

1 Those concerns on my part are not his ethical responsibilities. I think that's an issue 2 between he and his licensing authority. But 3 it's the impact of his statements that they may 4 have on these proceedings. And I would caution 5 the defense as well. There are allegations out 6 there from both sides that I don't know who they 7 are all attributed to. I don't care to get into 8 that at this point. But I think it would be in everybody's best interest if perhaps the 10 rhetoric were toned down. And I would ask you 11 to convey that to Colonel Davis. 12 13 You were going to say something, Mr. Ahmad. 14 15 I don't want to interrupt you, sir, but if I 16 CDC: could comment at some point when you are done, 17 I'd appreciate that opportunity. 18 19 Presiding Officer: I will give you that opportunity, 20 certainly. 21 22

105

Thank you, sir.

23

24

CDC:

Presiding Officer: Because at this point it's my intent
to hold this over until tomorrow afternoon, give
counsel an opportunity to brief and provide
additional exhibits should either side desire to
do so, so that I can make an intelligent ruling.
Realizing that there is some sense of urgency
because of this pending press conference is why
I'm making the comments that I am making at this
point, and giving the direction to Prosecutor

that I'm giving.

Obviously, the defense will be given that opportunity to conduct voir dire concerning -- of the members concerning the impact of any pretrial publicity, as will the government, concerning any pretrial publicity that may have been generated by either the defense or those sympathetic with the defense's case that might prejudice a panel against the government to where the government would be denied a full and fair trial, because they are entitled to that same full and fair trial that the accused is entitled to. You wanted to make a comment?

Yes, sir. First of all, I don't intend this to challenge in any way the decision that you've made. I've heard what you said and I accept it. I do in some sense want to apologize to both the Commission and the Prosecution. I by no means meant to spring 70 pages or whatever the number is at this late date. To be honest with you, when I went back and put it together, it was a larger packet than -- than I thought. We don't really know each other. I would like to assure you that this is not the way that I want to practice in this Commission.

CDC:

Presiding Officer: Mr. Ahmad, let me cut you off right now, because I've got to say from my dealings with both trial and defense up to this point, all the parties have been extremely professional. The briefs, particularly, and I made this comment at the 8-5 that counsel object to, but the briefs that I've been provided, have been particularly from defense, Captain Merriam, have been extremely well written, extremely well And I very much appreciate that. done. that level of professionalism and courtesy that 

1 often is missing in legal proceedings today and I appreciate the professionalism of all the 2 parties. 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

I do not question your ethics, your motives, or anything else in springing it, if you will, at the late time. I understand that things come up, that we've all been busy. It's short fused. People, in addition, to needing time to figure out what they need to do, they need to digest information and decide what the appropriate course is, confer with other counsel and things of that nature, so no apology is necessary. I don't have any issue there whatsoever.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Thank you, sir. And if I just briefly can say, CDC: then, I'm glad that that is the perception. That is how it is intended. I would not have made this motion at the late date if I didn't think it was serious enough and time sensitive enough.

22

23

24

Having said that, in your comments you noted that in the materials that I provided to the

24

Commission and to the prosecution that I have made press statements as well. And that is I heard and have accepted your recommendation regarding the care that we all take in speaking to the press and I agree with that. I just want to note, however, that there is a different standard to which the prosecution is held with regard to statements to the press than there is to the defense. And that's a legal standard. That's different as between their side of the table and my side of the table. So while I appreciate that in your observation that I did, in fact, make comments, I do want to say that I have a different role in this process than the prosecution does. And my role, my sole role is with respect to Omar The government has a role to prosecute, but they also have a role in terms of upholding the integrity of an entire system. And that's what's on the line. Sir, now I have an implicit role in that, but it's not the same. And the rules of ethics make that clear. That's exactly why there is a special rule in DC and in North Carolina and in the model rules -- and I don't

1 know this for sure, I would suspect in a number of other states in the United States. 2 a special rule with respect to prosecutors. 3 There is no special rule with respect to defense 4 lawyers. I seek to practice while here as I 5 would anywhere else to the highest ethical 6 standard possible, but I do wish to make clear 7 that structurally within our system of law there 8 is a different standard for prosecutors than 9 there are for defense lawyers. 10

11

12

13

14

Presiding Officer: All right. That's not a ruling.

You've made a statement. It's on the record,

and we are going to move on.

15

16

CDC: Yes, sir.

17

18 Presiding Officer: I happen to think that you are
19 correct in that regard. I also happen to think
20 that all counsel have a responsibility to try
21 their case in the forum where it's to be tried,
22 not in the press. And that's where I come down.
23 I think it does no one any good for either side
24 to put inflammatory, outrageous statements out

there that are not supported by either fact or law or otherwise.

It would be my hope that we would try this case here in this Commission room and not in the press. And I realize that the defense has a responsibility to look out for the interest of their client. I also recognize that the government does have a much greater responsibility and it's not to put somebody in jail, but to see that justice is served.

It's a principle that I fully support. With that in mind, what I intend to do is put this matter over until tomorrow. I would like the defense to serve the government their brief by 8 o'clock tomorrow morning. You have all night to work on it.

Prosecution, I want to see your response brief by noon. Some time after that, we will come back together and I will take a look at it and see if any additional orders from this Commission are in order.

2 All right. Any questions on that?

3

4 PROS: No, sir.

5

Presiding Officer: When I say "your briefs," also if 6 there's evidence that either side desires to 7 submit in support of their position, I would ask 8 that you exchange that at the earliest 9 opportunity with opposing counsel and provide it 10 to the Commission at the earliest opportunity, 11 because a lot of it takes a long time to read. 12 Particularly, I note there is an article in here 13 from Colonel Davis. It's a very lengthy 14 Article, 20 some-odd pages. So if there's those 15 types of things that you are wanting each 16 side -- the other side to look at and me to look 17 at, it would be very helpful if I had that 18 19 earlier rather than later. And I'm here until Saturday. I can be here until Saturday of the 20 week after. So we can take as long as we need, 21 and we will take as long as we need to sort 22 through it. All right? 23

1		It's 1825. We've been here for quite some time.
2		I would like counsel's thoughts on whether we
3		should take a recess here in the building, have
4		dinner and then come back on the record to
5		finish up the other things that we have to do
6		tonight.
7		
8	PROS:	The prosecution would just as soon continue,
9		sir.
10		
11	Presiding	g Officer: Captain Merriam, your desires?
12		There's not a lot more that we have to do, but
13		there are some other things we need to do.
14		
15	DC:	Okay, sir. I think we can finish what I think
16		we have to do remaining on the trial script, so
17		to speak, but, you know, other than this motion
18		tomorrow, I don't think there's anything else we
19		need to take up.
20		
21	Presiding	g Officer: Right, but do you want to continue
22		tonight or do you want to take a break for
23		dinner and then continue. I don't know whether
24		your client needs to eat dinner. I believe they

would bring a dinner to him here.

3 DC: Sir, one minute.

Sir, if I could ask the Presiding Officer just

what else do we think, other than argue this

motion, what else is it that the parties believe

we have to take up? I'm not sure what -- I mean

is there something else we can't resolve right

now before -- what would we be coming back from

dinner to resolve, sir?

Presiding Officer: I still want to ask the accused for his pleas, even though he's indicated he's going to reserve them. I'm not going to ask you to enter them. I just want to call for those.

I think you've already indicated you want to reserve motions with the exception of one motion. I want to discuss the trial schedule.

We've discussed quite extensively your motion for a continuance. However, I have not mentioned, and I did intend to mention, your motion for an abatement of the proceedings, not

to litigate but simply indicate for the record that you had made that motion, that I denied that motion. I believe that was RE-37. As I indicated, I denied your motion for an abatement. I did not rule on the issue. And as I indicated in the 8-5, I invite counsel, should you deem that appropriate, to raise a motion during the motions session, or Colonel Vokey.

I issued a discovery order, it's RE-20. I wanted to remind counsel of the dates that are contained in there. Government, you have a responsibility to provide discovery too. And at this point it would be to Captain Merriam, until such time as either Colonel Vokey or other Detailed Defense Counsel comes on the case, provide that discovery to the defense.

Defense, you have until the 28th of February to provide reciprocal discovery. I gave counsel a 31 January 2006 deadline for filing a motion to object to the discovery order or the way it was being executed.

1		However, we need to talk about the trial
2		schedule and I think it would appropriate to
3		modify that date to make it consistent with
4		whatever motions dates we come up with.
5		
6		I think that would be all of it. I think that
7		would be all of the things I would want to
8		discuss tonight, short of giving you, Captain
9		Merriam, the opportunity to put anything in the
10		record concerning the 8-5 that I didn't already
11		discuss that you think is appropriate to go in
12		the record. So with that in mind, do you want
13		to take a recess for dinner or do you want to
14		press on?
15		
16	DC:	Sir, I'm just going to consult with my client
17		for one minute.
18		
19	Presiding	g Officer: Please.
20		
21	The defer	nse counsel conferred with the accused.
22		
23	Presiding	g Officer: There's one other issue I want to
24		discuss before we break today, and that's the

1		accused's attire. Again, we can take that up
2		now or after we eat dinner. What is the
3		defense's preference?
4		
5	DC:	Sir, our preference would be to break for dinner
6		and then come back.
7		
8	Presidin	g Officer: All right. Well, how long let's
9		break. The security personnel can figure how
10		long it will take and then once everybody is
11		ready to go, we'll reconvene. All right?
12		
13	DC:	Yes, sir.
14		
15	Presidin	g Officer: The court's in recess.
16		
17	The Comm	ission hearing recessed at 1830, 11 January 2006.
18		
19	The Comm	ission hearing was called to order at 1930,
20	11 Janua	ry 2006.
21		
22	Presidin	g Officer: The Commission will come to order.
23		All those present when the Commission recessed
24		are again present.

```
1
                All right. At this time I want to go ahead and
2
                ask the accused to enter pleas, understanding he
3
                intends to reserve those pleas.
4
5
                Accused and counsel, please rise.
6
7
      The accused and his counsel did as directed.
8
9
      Presiding Officer: Mr. Khadr, I now ask you: How you
10
                plead? Understanding that you are entitled to
11
12
                reserve those pleas, please be seated.
13
                Sir, may I speak for the accused?
14
      DC:
15
      Presiding Officer: At this point?
16
17
                Yes, sir.
      DC:
18
19
      Presiding Officer: On what issue?
20
21
                Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you required an
      DC:
22
23
                answer.
```

Presiding Officer: No, no. I understand he wants to

reserve those. I just formally want to do that

on the record. I think I already mentioned the

motion by the defense to abate, and that's been

marked as an appellate exhibit. I want to take

up the issue of scheduling at this point. And

let me preface that with a comment that I

understand that there may, in fact, and most

likely will be a new detailed defense counsel in

this case, that he obviously hasn't agreed to

that schedule. That's all understood.

If Colonel Vokey or some other counsel comes on to the case, then they certainly are welcome to suggest or request a modification to that schedule. But I think it's important that we at least establish some kind of a timeframe that we want to get things done by so that we can start working towards those.

As I said, Captain Merriam represents the accused at this time, and will continue to represent him until such time as he is relieved along with Mr. Ahmad. I'm not sure what will

happen with Mr. Wilson whether he intends to

actually make an appearance or not. If he does,

we will take that up when it happens. I was

provided a proposed schedule. Has then be

marked as a review exhibit at all?

**PROS:** It has not, sir.

Presiding Officer: All right. I think what I will do is I'll just simply mention these dates here on the record. As I indicated I gave counsel until the 31st of January to submit objections to the discovery order. I'm going to modify that so that it is consistent with this proposed schedule. And what I would expect is motions --and the parties have couched these as legal motions. That's as good of characterization, I think, as any. 

Basically, we are talking about motions that don't depend on discovery that we would -- those motions would be served on opposing counsel and the Commission no later than the 24th of February; responses to those by the 10th of

March; replies by 17 March and then during the week, and I've indicated a week here, and I told 2 counsel that, of 27 March, sometime during that 3 week we would return here to Guantanamo Bay to 4 litigate those motions. Those dates apply 5 equally to any objections to the discovery 6

order.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

7

1

Evidentiary motions, again, motions that would require discovery and I would include in that anything such as witnesses, request for investigative assistance, expert witnesses, anything along that line I would expect to see those motions served on opposing counsel and the Commission by 14 April; responses by the 28<sup>th</sup>; replies by the 5th of May. And then, again, during the week of 22 May we would return here to Guantanamo Bay to litigate those evidentiary type motions. And I understand, Captain Merriam, that you haven't spoken -- I'm presuming you haven't spoken to Colonel Vokey on I would presume that, but you are otherwise it. amenable to these dates; is that right?

1 DC: Yes, sir. 2 Presiding Officer: Captain Merriam. 3 4 DC: Yes, sir. 5 6 Presiding Officer: Is there anything else about the 8-5 7 that has not been reflected in the record that 8 you would like to reflect for the record that 9 you believe needs to be summarized for a 10 11 complete record? 12 Yes, sir. I submitted a Review Exhibit to the 13 DC: court reporter. I think its been marked 54; is 14 that correct, 54, the next in order. 15 contains a narrative based on notes of defense 16 counsel of what transpired in the 8-5. I 17 18 provided it to the government, I'm not sure they've had enough time to review it. 19 20 Presiding Officer: Let's do this. We are going to get 21 back together at 1300 tomorrow. Major, if 22 there's an issue there where either something 23 that you are in a disagreement with, assuming 24

1 it's material. Let's bring it up and we can resolve it tomorrow. 2 3 Yes, sir. PROS: 4 5 **Presiding Officer:** Is that acceptable? 6 7 Yes, sir. 8 DC: 9 Presiding Officer: The last thing I have that I wanted 10 11 to discuss was the accused's attire. And I understand there are some logistic challenges. 12 I consider his attire inappropriate. I consider 13 any shirts with logos to better left for places 14 other than a court of law and a Commission. If 15 possible, by tomorrow I would like that 16 resolved. I think the trousers are fine but the 17 shirt is not. 18 19 If Mr. Ahmad, Captain Merriam, you cannot 20 resolve that by yourselves. Major, I would ask 21 you and perhaps you can seek the assistance of 22 the JTF personnel before Mr. Khadr appears 23 before this Commission again. I'm not talking 24

```
1
                about a business suit or anything, but perhaps a
                collared shirt without logo would be more
2
                appropriate. All right?
3
4
      PROS: Yes, sir.
5
6
      Presiding Officer: Any questions on that?
7
8
               No, sir.
9
      DC:
10
      Presiding Officer: Anything else either side wants to
11
                address before we recess for the evening?
12
13
      PROS:
               No, sir.
14
15
      DC:
               None, sir.
16
17
      Presiding Officer: Mr. Ahmad?
18
19
               No, sir.
      CDC:
20
21
      Presiding Officer: All right, until 1300, then, tomorrow
22
                the Commission will be in recess.
23
```

1 The Commission hearing recessed at 1937, 11 January 2006.

2

3 The Commissions Hearing was called to order at 1530,

4 12 January 2006.

5

Presiding Officer: The hearing will come to order. All those present when we recessed are again present.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Let me apologize, first, for the delay. I know there are many people who are sitting around for a long time expecting this to start at 1300. The issues that are to be decided are extremely important, and it will be my intent throughout the proceedings to give counsel and myself the time we need to handle those issues in an appropriate manner. Regrettably, that may inconvenience some of the people, particularly observers and the media. I regret that. will try to keep you informed so that you can plan accordingly, but it will happen. And as you saw yesterday, the sessions may go much later than you might otherwise be used to. Again, we will try to keep you informed so that

1		you can pran accordingry.
2		
3		The first thing I want to take up with counsel
4		is RE-54, which was the defense summary of the
5		8-5 session. I believe it just addresses
6		10 January 2006; is that correct, Captain?
7		
8	DC:	Yes, sir, that's correct.
9		
10	Presidi	ng Officer: And I would note that we did have a
11		short lectern of sorts placed at each counsel
12		table. I would ask counsel to use that. I
13		think it will assist in the difficulty with the
14		microphones picking up what people are saying.
15		It's also, I think, a little more convenient for
16		the use of counsel as well, although you will
17		have to move to it.
18		
19		Major did you have any objections to,
20		additions to, or comments about RE-54?
21		
22	PROS:	Just a couple comments, sir. I agreed with the
23		notes in large part, but I did want to note that
24		in Paragraph 5 Captain Merriam talked about, or

stated that the Presiding Officer does not rule at an 8-5 session, and follows on and talks about your practices after the Presiding Officer makes a ruling. My recollection of the 8-5 conference, that those were separate thoughts and not connected.

7

1

2

3

4

5

6

Presiding Officer: I think that's fair. I noticed 8 Captain Merriam, you are shaking your head, yes, 9 approvingly. I don't think it was intended to 10 run those together. As I recall, he was writing 11 rather rapidly both, I believe, he and 12 Mr. Ahmad, and they were separate thoughts. I 13 was simply trying to give counsel some guidance 14 of my practice, because none of you have 15 practiced in front of me and have the benefit of 16 that. I, like I think any judicial official, if 17 I can use that term, Presiding Officer in this 18 case, have my own quirks, things that I expect 19 of counsel. And I think it's helpful if you 20 know those in advance, so we don't have to 21 embarrass anybody here on the record in front of 22 anybody. And if they are a problem for anybody, 23 we can discuss them and resolve those. 24

1 Anything else? 2 3 In Paragraph 9, sir, I note that Captain PROS: 4 Merriam's notes have Mr. Hodges asking Professor 5 Ahmad about the accused's intentions regarding 6 representation. My recollection was that the 7 Presiding Officer asked that question. I don't 8 know that it matters to the defense, but that 9 was my recollection of it. 10 11 12 Presiding Officer: I don't know that it matters either. I know Mr. Hodges did ask some questions. 13 don't recall if he asked that specific question. 14 I do know in Paragraph 8 it does indicate that I 15 asked about Mr. Wilson simply to find out if he 16 intended to appear before the Commission. 17 don't see it as a discrepancy of any particular 18 moment. And I will defer to the defense's 19 recollection quite frankly. 20 21 The only other note that I had, sir, was 22 PROS:

would be wearing in court sessions.

23

24

Paragraph 29 where we discussed what the accused

1 recollection was that the Presiding Officer said that he would not be wearing a jumpsuit under 2 any circumstances. There was no question about 3 whether that was possible. 4 5 Presiding Officer: Well, that's not what I said. That's 6 what I intended, and that's the case. 7 8 Anything else? 9 10 PROS: That's all I have, sir. 11 12 Presiding Officer: All right. And taking up the issue 13 of attire, I note that Mr. Khadr is attired in 14 a -- what I consider a more apropriate, a 15 regular collared shirt, long sleeve shirt, 16 button down the front. And I think that is more 17 appropriate attire for the nature of these 18 proceedings. 19 20 Again, defense counsel, if there is some other 21 particular attire along that line that the 22 defense would like to see, please attempt to do 23

24

so. If you can't resolve it on your own, let me

know and I'll in turn -- or let the Prosecutor
know, rather, and I'm sure they will be able to
assist you. All right?

4

5 **DC:** Thank you, sir. The government was very helpful in assisting us with getting this attire.

7

Presiding Officer: Thank you. The one thing that I did 8 want to note, and it has to do with the -- your 9 summary of the 8-5. One of the things that we 10 did discuss during the 8-5 that is not included 11 in here is how individuals will be addressed. 12 And I indicated that I would address counsel by 13 their grade and their last name, and Mr. Ahmad 14 by Mr. and Ahmad as I've done throughout, and 15 that I would address Mr. Khadr as such. 16 Khadr is an adult. This is about as an official 17 and important a forum as I can envision. He's 18 on trial for murder. I think it's appropriate 19 that he be addressed as Mr. Khadr and not by his 20 first name or his given name. And I will task 21 counsel to do so both in writing and in their 22 oral colloquy that we have here in court. 23

1		Any questions on that?
2		
3	DC:	No, sir.
4		
5	PROS:	Sir, I would only ask that we could refer to Mr.
6		Khadr as the accused.
7		
8	Presidi	ng Officer: Well, yes. What I'm saying is not by
9		his first name only, either the accused, Mr.
10		Khadr, but not Omar. I think that represents
11		too casual an approach, given the nature of the
12		proceedings.
13		
14		The other thing I'm not sure of in RE-54, there
15		are some things that are in bold print, and
16		there are some things that are not. Is there
17		any significance to that, Captain Merriam?
18		
19	DC:	Sir, not really. The significance is just that
20		those were things that we considered important.
21		This was intended just to be my best recapture
22		of our combined notes. And those were things
23		that in our notes we would have put a star by or
24		underlined. It was entirely for emphasis.

1	
2	Presiding Officer: Strictly for your internal use?
3	
4	DC: Yes, sir.
5	
6	Presiding Officer: Because, quite frankly, I don't
7	attach any particular significance to one
8	paragraph vice another. And in attaching this
9	to the record, I will note that I did not.
10	
11	DC: Understood, sir.
12	
13	Presiding Officer: And I do consider it a fair summary
14	of what was discussed. Let me also say just for
15	the benefit you can go ahead and have a seat
16	Captain Merriam.
17	
18	The defense counsel did as directed.
19	
20	Presiding Officer: While you are free to do this if you
21	like. It seems like a lot of effort. I think
22	my experience, and I think the traditional
23	practice is you note things that are of

particular significance, or that you object to,

or that I perhaps left out when I summarized it, as opposed to trying to summarize every possible thing that was said during the meeting. It might save you some time. I mean, it's your call. If this is what you want to do, how you want to spend your time, it's your time. You are the best manager of that time. So I just point that out.

Mr. Ahmad, yesterday during your discussions, initially, we talked about the need for a translation service for Mr. Khadr. You said you weren't sure how things were going to go, but after the first proceeding perhaps you would know better. Have you got anymore insight as to the need for a translator for him?

CDC:

Sir, I believe that we'll be okay without a translator. I guess what I had in mind was at the close of the proceeding, meaning since it got carried over today, at the close of today, I'd like to have a conversation with Mr. Khadr before Captain Merriam and I leave. My sense

at this point is that things are working fine without an interpreter and that that's probably how things will be in the future. But if it's all right with you, I'd would like to reserve final --

Presiding Officer: You can reserve that, and that's fine. And if it comes up -- if you waive on a translator or interpreter and it comes to a point where you decide you need one, with appropriate time to get the people here, please just let me know and we will make that available. As I said yesterday, it's very important Mr. Khadr understand what's being said in these proceedings. So if that becomes something that you think is necessary or helpful, let me know and we will make it happen. 

CDC: Yes, sir. I appreciate that. I think that, as has happened in the proceeding yesterday, there will be times when I think we'll have to take a little bit of a break. But that has less to do with Arabic versus English and more to do with

1 the complexity of the terminology. 2 3 Presiding Officer: All right. Well, that's common for any criminal proceeding and has nothing to do 4 generally with an individual's grasp of English 5 as much as it is just the concepts that are 6 being thrown around in the courtroom. So 7 that's fine. 8 9 Yes, sir. 10 CDC: 11 Presiding Officer: Please let me know if something of 12 particular significance, you need a recess in 13 order to go somewhere else to discuss it where 14 you can have a little more privacy and spend a 15 little longer discussing it. Again, just let 16 me know and we'll make that available to you. 17 18 Thank you, sir. CDC: 19 20 PROS: Sir, if I could address that briefly. I would 21 just ask that we have at least 30 days notice 22 if the defense does want translator services. 23 The government does procure those in D.C. We 24

1		have to make arrangements to have the
2		translators travel to Guantanamo Bay. Country
3		clearances are involved and the availability of
4		
5		
6	Presidin	g Officer: I understand the logistics involved
7		in getting anybody out here. If that's
8		possible, Mr. Ahmad, keeping in mind I know
9		that things may come up and
10		
11	CDC:	Yes, sir, I certainly can represent that I will
12		make every effort to give that 30-day notice.
13		And, again, absent something that comes up
14		unexpected, I think we should be able to comply
15		with that.
16		
17	Presidin	g Officer: All right.
18		
19	PROS:	Thank you, sir.
20		
21	Presidin	g Officer: One of the other things I have on my
22		list that we are supposed to take up today is
23		Protective Order 3. There was some e-mail
24		traffic bouncing back and forth, I know. I,

quite frankly, haven't had a chance to review 1 I believe that you all were sent an e-mail 2 from Mr. Hodges, the Assistant to the Presiding 3 Officer. There were some reservations that were noted on it, I think, in a footnote. I know there was really no response from anybody, so what we'll do when we get done 7 here, or at some point, I'll take a look at 8 that. Because, quite frankly, I haven't had a 9 chance to review it in its entirety. And we'll 10 resolve that, again, before we leave here 11 today. If we need an additional 8 -- I'm 12 13 sorry, you wanted to say something, Major 14

15

16 **PROS:** Sir, I believe we both agree at this point and there should be e-mail traffic reflecting that.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Presiding Officer: Okay. Well, like I said, I haven't had a chance to fully look at it. Before we leave here today we'll resolve that. Again, if we need to we'll do it here in the courtroom. It appears we do not. But we'll resolve that before we' leave here today and I'll sign off

1 on that. 2 I also wanted to note for the record that RE-61 3 is the most current filings inventory. It has 4 been updated since yesterday. I believe 5 counsel for both sides have a copy of that; is 6 that correct? 7 8 Yes, sir. PROS: 9 10 11 DC: Yes, sir. 12 Presiding Officer: It may be possible too for you to 13 just yell out yes, sir loud enough that you 14 don't have to actually move that far. I think 15 if it's going to be a long discussion, get 16 behind the microphone, if it's going to be a 17 very quick response, I think it will be 18 satisfactory if you just make it without moving 19 over. 20 21 And I assume both counsel have seen RE-56, 22 which is the most current e-mail traffic 23 concerning the availability of Lieutenant 24

1 Colonel Vokey. It would appear from that that Colonel Vokey is either approved or will 2 shortly be approved. I would consider that 3 then a closed matter other than the decision as 4 to whether you, Captain Merriam, stay on the 5 case. As soon as that has been decided, if you 6 would please inform both the prosecution as 7 well as myself so we know whether to keep you 8 on the list or not. As I said yesterday Colonel Vokey is a very experienced trial 10 11 attorney, one I hold in very high regard. However, that said, I think the defense in the 12 ends of justice would be well served were 13 Captain Merriam to remain on the case. 14 would encourage Colonel Sullivan to approve 15 that, should that be Mr. Khadr's desire. 16 17 Yesterday, Mr. Khadr, you had indicated you had 18 wanted a Canadian lawyer to represent you; is 19 that right? 20 21 ACC: Yes, sir. 22

Presiding Officer: And what was his name again?

23

The accused conferred with counsel.

Presiding Officer: That's fine, Mr. Ahmad, you can -I'm going to ask you to address the issue any
way.

CDC: Sure. Yes, sir.

I believe that Mr. Khadr's wishes at this point, that he had wanted to make the request for a Canadian counsel of choice, and to be able to make that choice in consultation with Lieutenant Colonel Vokey once he is able to come on board.

Presiding Officer: Okay. Well, what I would ask you to do until Colonel Vokey gets on board is perhaps you can take some preliminary steps. I have no idea who this individual is, what his citizenship is, bar licensing, whether he would be even eligible to be approved as a civilian counsel, authorized to practice before the Commission. It's possible he could. But I 

would ask that you start making those preliminary inquiries to see if that's a possibility. Also perhaps look at the possibility of perhaps him joining the defense team in some capacity whether he would be willing to do that, whether that's something that Mr. Khadr after consulting with Colonel Vokey might want to avail themselves of.

CDC: Yes, sir.

Presiding Officer: I would note, and I do believe it to be the case, although I would hope him to be persuaded otherwise, that even though an individual were not approved as counsel to practice before the Commission, that wouldn't necessarily preclude them from assisting as part of the defense team in trial preparation and things of that nature. Also given the requirements for security of protected information and things of that nature. So that may be -- although not the ideal alternative, but maybe something that would be of value or assist the defense. And I would ask you to 

1 start working that, given in particular that we do have at lease some initial milestones on the 2 ground that we want to achieve. All right? 3 4 CDC: Yes, sir. 5 6 Presiding Officer: And the last thing I want to ask, 7 and I'll address this to you, Mr. Ahmad. 8 some of the articles that I read, and there 9 were a number of them, and frankly it was a 10 voluminous number of articles. Several of 11 those seem to attribute to you a concern that 12 the accused has some chronic health problems. 13 And I have not heard anything from you or from 14 Captain Merriam that would indicate that 15 those -- whatever those problems are, I have no 16 idea what they are, would in any way interfere 17 with the accused being here and participating 18 in these proceedings. 19 20 Is that an issue that you intend to raise at 21 some point? 22

CDC: I've not had a conversation with Captain

23

1		Merriam about that, and I haven't had the
2		intention to do that.
3		
4	Presidin	g Officer: Okay. So at this point his health
5		is not an issue for today's session?
6		
7	CDC:	That's right, sir.
8		
9	Presidin	g Officer: Well, if it does become an issue,
10		what I would ask you to do is at your earliest
11		opportunity to make that known to the
12		prosecution and to me so that we can address it
13		as early on as possible. From my observations
14		he doesn't appear to be suffering in any way.
15		So if it does become a problem, let me know so
16		we can address it in a timely fashion. All
17		right?
18		
19	CDC:	Yes, sir.
20		
21	Presidin	g Officer: And I think that brings us to the
22		primary purpose of our session today and that
23		is the defense motion concerning conversations
24		or contact by Colonel Davis, the Chief

Prosecutor in this case, with the press and statements attributed to him.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

Let me say at the outset that counsel were given an extremely short time to respond, that it's some of the best motion writing I've seen. They were extremely helpful, extremely well written. The documents that accompany them were very very thorough. Well, with one caveat, and as a function of printing, when you print from an internet explorer from some of those documents, it chopped off the right five or six letters or something. You can all look at what you sent me and see that. I don't think anything is lost because of that, if it were, I would of asked for them. I don't feel anything is lost, but I do appreciate that. I know it was a lot of work on your part and it was very well done.

20

21

22

23

24

I also received along with those things the permissions that I'd asked about as to whether counsel had been given permission to address the press, one of the requirements of

1		Commission law, and I have those. And I
2		appreciate you providing those to me. Those
3		have been marked as REs.
4		
5		What I'd like to do now is address the defense
6		motion, which is RE-55. And I'm going to
7		assume, Mr. Ahmad, you are going to take the
8		lead on this; is that correct?
9		
10	CDC:	Yes, sir, I am.
11		
12	Presiding	g Officer: All right. And I also am going to
13		assume that RE-53, which is the materials that
14		you provided to the Presiding Officer
15		yesterday, you want me to consider along with
16		the other materials you provided?
17		
18	CDC:	I do, sir. And I realized that there I'd
19		like to make a correct in the matter of errata
20		in the brief because I referred to
21		
22	Presiding	g Officer: I don't use words like that.
23		
24	CDC.	I'm corry it's a minor correction in the brief

1		that we submitted on the motion. Throughout i
2		I refer to it as Review Exhibit 54, and that
3		should be 53, which is the packet that was
4		submitted yesterday.
5		
6	Presiding	g Officer: All right. I appreciate that.
7		
8	CDC:	I don't know if you want me to submit a
9		corrected motion or if this is enough for the
10		record?
11		
12	Presiding	g Officer: No, that's fine. Is it also your
13		desire that I consider your arguments that you
14		made yesterday?
15		
16	CDC:	Yes, sir.
17		
18	Presiding	g Officer: All right. And I will do so
19		well, any objection to that? Who is going to
20		take this for the government?
21		
22	APROS:	Your Honor, I will, sir.
23		
24	Presidin	g Officer. All right Any objection to that?

1		
2	APROS:	No objection, Your Honor.
3		
4	Presiding	Officer: I will consider all of those
5		documents along with the argument you made
6		yesterday.
7		
8		And I have RE-60, which is the government's
9		response brief. Again, with a number of
10		documents attached to that and it's your desire
11		Lieutenant it's right.
12		
13	APROS:	Yes, Your Honor.
14		
15	Presiding	officer: Any objection to my considering
16		that?
17		
18	APROS:	Could you repeat what it is you are
19		considering, sir? I apologize.
20		
21	Presiding	Officer: Your brief with all your
22		attachments.
23		
24	APROS:	Yes, sir, I would appreciate it if you consider

1 that. 2 Presiding Officer: You want me to consider that? 3 4 Yes, sir. APROS: 5 6 Presiding Officer: All right. Any objection to my 7 considering that, Mr. Ahmad? 8 9 No, sir. CDC: 10 11 Presiding Officer: And I will consider that. You've 12 indicated you wanted to make oral argument. 13 14 Yes, sir. CDC: 15 16 Presiding Officer: I heard a lot of oral argument 17 yesterday. I've read, as I indicated, a very 18 well written brief with extensive argument in 19 20 it from both you and from the government counsel. What I'm going to do is I'm going to 21 allow you to argue but only matters that are 22 not otherwise contained in your brief or if you 23 want to rebut something that's contained in the

1 government's brief I'll allow you to address that. But I would ask you to be brief if it's, 2 otherwise, simply tit-for-tat on your brief 3 their responding to your brief. 4 5 CDC: Yes, sir. Yes, my intention is to rest 6 primarily on our brief and only to address 7 matters that arose in light of the government's 8 responsive brief. 9 10 The first point that I'd like to raise, sir, is 11 12 that as I read the government's brief, there's a large gap in it. In that, in our motion we 13 made two, what I saw to be two, primary points. 14 One was based on Rule 3.6 of various rules of 15 conduct. 16 17 Presiding Officer: Let me stop you right there. 18 19 CDC: Yes. 20 21 Presiding Officer: I want to -- it seems to me, as I 22 read all of those rules, that they are, if not 23

24

identical, extremely close and that all of them

1		have a provision that essentially bars counsel,
2		not prosecutors, not the defense counsel, not
3		respondent's counsel, but counsel appearing
4		before a tribunal of any sort, be it
5		court-martial, civil court, federal court, or
6		military Commission, which I think qualifies,
7		from making extrajudicial statements that a
8		reasonable person would believe would prejudice
9		the other party; is that a fair statement?
10		
11	CDC:	I would modify the last part in terms of the
12		subject of the prejudice. I think it could be
13		the other party, but it could also be in the
14		fairness of the proceeding.
15		
16	Presiding	officer: Exactly. Okay. That's
17		
18	CDC:	Otherwise I agree with that characterization,
19		sir.
20		
21	Presiding	Officer: And that prohibition applies to both
22		sides of the dispute.
23		

That's correct, sir.

24

CDC:

1		
2	Presiding	Officer: You would agree with that?
3		
4	CDC:	May I add a caveat?
5		
6	Presiding	Officer: Yes.
7		
8	CDC:	Which is, and I won't belabor this because I
9		did raise it in the brief, but I do believe
10		that particularly the comments to Rule 3.8 of
11		the Rules of the District of Columbia makes
12		clear that the rules, even though they are as
13		they are written applicable to all lawyers, may
14		be applicable in greater sense to prosecution
15		than to the defense.
16		
17	Presiding	Officer: Okay. Well, I'll get to that point
18		in just a minute.
19		
20	CDC:	Yes, sir.
21		
22	Presiding	Officer: Because I think that most, if not
23		all of the rules do, and I think you said this

yesterday, I believe I agreed with you in a

1 general since, that prosecutors do enjoy a heightened responsibility. It's not, as I said 2 yesterday, to get a conviction. It is not to 3 put somebody in jail. It is to seek justice. 4 5 Yes, sir. 6 CDC: 7 Presiding Officer: I think we are in agreement there. 8 9 I believe we are, sir. CDC: 10 11 Presiding Officer: But my more basic point is that you 12 would agree that all of the particular codes 13 that you cited to have similar provisions that 14 place the responsibility on the attorneys 15 concerning extrajudicial comments as well as 16 the heightened responsibility on the 17 prosecutor. 18 19 I agree with that. And, again, with CDC: Yes. 20 respect to the rules, for example, 3.6 which 21 does not speak to prosecutors, it just speaks 22

24

23

to attorneys.

1	Presidin	g Officer: Right.
2		
3	CDC:	The only slight difference I would draw is that
4		I do believe the commentary on the rules,
5		particularly in the District of Columbia may
6		suggest very strongly that, for example 3.6
7		
8	Presidin	g Officer: Hold on just a minute.
9		
10	CDC:	Yes.
11		
12	Presidin	g Officer: I'm not sure what's going on with
13		the PA system, but he's wigging in and out on
14		me. It's very distracting. Is that something
15		we can fix? I don't know who is responsible.
16		I've got people all over the courtroom. Can we
17		fix that? I don't know if you can do it with
18		your table or something, he's wigging in and
19		out.
20		
21	CDC:	I certainly don't mean to wig out.
22		
23	Presidin	g Officer: I'm sure you don't. All right.
24		Maybe it's not something we can address right

now, but maybe we can address it.

2

3 CDC: I can certainly try to stay closer to the microphone.

5

Presiding Officer: I don't think -- I don't see it as something you are doing. It seems like something to do with the audio.

9

10 Go ahead.

11

Okay. Well, sir, again, the commentary to Rule CDC: 12 3.8 of the Rules of Professional Conduct for 13 the District of Columbia includes language 14 where it suggests very strongly that even if 15 there was a rule that applies generally to all 16 attorneys, that rule, that the ability under 17 one of those rules of general applicability to 18 do something -- for example, pretrial 19 extrajudicial statements -- may be less 20 21 available to a prosecutor than to another lawyer. That's within the commentary I can 22 provide you a citation in the packet of RE-53 23 that was put in yesterday. 24

2 Presiding Officer: That's fine. I've read it and I
3 understand your point.

CDC: But beyond that, I do agree with your general principle that, for example, 3.6 certainly is applicable to defense counsel and to the prosecution. The difference I would draw is I don't believe they are necessarily equally applicable.

Presiding Officer: All right. You would agree also that within all of the codes that you cited there's an exception to the rule where a party to a dispute, to include a prosecutor, has the right to address extrajudicial -- or make extrajudicial comments in order to address a circumstance where there is some kind of an inflammatory, misleading, or otherwise problematic thing out there in the public that impacts his ability to be a prosecutor, defense counsel, civil litigation, whatever, to obtain a fair and impartial trial for that individual or that attorney's client. 

2 **CDC:** Respectfully, sir, I think that your
3 characterization is overbroad in a few
4 different ways.

5

6 **Presiding Officer:** Okay.

7

First, I certainly do agree that there's a 8 CDC: provision within several of the codes we have 9 cited that permits a kind of rebuttal by a 10 lawyer. But I don't believe -- and I would 11 like to have the opportunity to check -- I 12 don't believe that that is part of -- that is 13 part of Rule 3.6 of the Rule of North Carolina. 14 I believe it's 3.6C in the rules of North 15 I don't believe that there is an Carolina. 16 analogous provision in 3.6 of the District of 17 Columbia. So it's not -- and so what that 18 means, sir -- and I think this is one of the 19 20 things that makes this motion a bit complicated -- is I agree with your statement 21 at the outset that we have several different 22 bodies, sources of Rules of Professional 23 Conduct that are applicable, and they are 24

roughly equivalent.

3	But there are, in fact, some important
4	distinctions between them. Having said that,
5	the last point in which I think that your
6	characterization is overbroad, is that looking
7	for example at 3.6C of the Rules of North
8	Carolina, what it protects against is it allows
9	a lawyer to make a statement, an extrajudicial
10	statement, when that lawyer reasonably believes
11	it is required to protect a client against
12	substantial undue prejudical effect of recent
13	publicity not initiated by the lawyer or the
14	lawyer's client. I believe that that language
15	that I just read, sir, is narrower than the
16	characterization that you made. It's not just
17	any type of prejudice. It's not just anything
18	that's inflammatory. It has to be keyed to a
19	particular form of undue judicial prejudicial
20	effect to a client. It can't just be out there
21	in the world, we don't like that this was said
22	or we think that's inflammatory.

Presiding Officer: Let me ask you a question, then. Do

```
1
                you dispute that the prosecutors have a client
                here?
2
3
       CDC:
                I don't dispute that, sir.
4
5
      Presiding Officer: Would you agree that the United
6
7
                States Government is their client?
8
9
       CDC:
                I do agree to that, sir, yes.
10
       Presiding Officer: Specifically, though, under the D.C.
11
                code, you do not believe there's an exception
12
                that allows a prosecutor to address this
13
                concern for something that's in the public
14
                arena that's prejudicing his client's ability
15
                to get a fair trial?
16
17
                That's correct, sir. In my --
18
       CDC:
19
       Presiding Officer: Okay.
20
21
                That's my understanding of 3.6 of the D.C. rules.
       CDC:
22
23
       Presiding Officer: Okay. Please continue.
24
```

Thank you, sir. I think that your raising of CDC: 2 3.6 is important. And the prosecution, in 3 their brief, certainly places their focus on 4 3.6. I think that's appropriate. It's quite 5 true that as defense, and I'll say it for 6 myself, since I am cited to several times --7 the comments of mine are cited to several times 8 in the prosecution's brief. I certainly am 9 governed by 3.6 and my case is in the District 10 of Columbia and in New York because that's 11 where I am barred. And I would represent that 12 I believe --13

14

15

16

17

Presiding Officer: That's not to say you are barred from Columbia and New York. You are a member of the bar of Columbia and New York?

18

DC: That's right, sir. They may want to bar me,
but so far that hasn't happened. I believe
that my comments are within that scope. Now
the problem that I see in the government's
brief is that they've spent quite a bit of time
on 3.6 and I would like to come back to that

because I don't think that they've addressed it with sufficient attention to the differences among the rules. But even if they did, even if I were to concede that their analysis of 3.6 is correct, nowhere in their brief, sir, do they make mention of Rule 3.8. Three point eight exists in three different relevant bodies of Rules of Professional Conduct, the District of Columbia, North Carolina, and the naval rules.

Presiding Officer: I think there's -- I believe there's an equivalent under the Air Force rule. They don't number theirs the same, but I think there's an equivalent provision under the Air Force Rules.

CDC: I believe that there is. In terms of specific language that we relied upon in our brief, I don't believe that's there but I certainly could be wrong on that. If I would -- because I'm not sure, I'm going to limit my discussion to D.C., North Carolina and the Naval Rules.

And what -- at the outset I think what's

1 important to recognize is what the name of that rule is. 2 3 In D.C. that rule is titled, "Special 4 Responsibilities of a Prosecutor." In North 5 Carolina, that rule is entitled, "Special 6 Responsibilities of a Prosecutor." In the 7 Naval rules, that rule is entitled, "Special 8 Responsibilities of a Trial Counsel and other Government Counsel." My understanding is that 10 11 trial counsel in the Naval system is the prosecutor. 12 13 Presiding Officer: Okay. I'm stopping you here because 14 I've read all of this. Okay. So I would like 15 for you to get to the specific point. 16 17 Yes, sir. The point is that none of this is CDC: 18 19 mentioned in the government's brief. The vast majority of our brief is committed to 3.8, 20 because 3.8 deals with not a generic rule of 21 professional conduct, that as you noted with 22 respect to 3.6, applies to the defense and to 23

24

the prosecution. And, again, I would note that

1	-	I don't think they apply equally. But the
2	Ġ	government never even mentions 3.8, even though
3	1	that is what we place a great deal of emphasis
4	C	on. And it arises in three different relevant
5	\$	sources of professional conduct.
6		
7	1	Now, in my view, sir, the absence of attention
8	1	to Rule 3.8 from these different bodies of law,
9	1	by the government, is reflective of the problem
10	<u>-</u>	in the Chief Prosecutor's statements at the
11	·	January 10th press conference. Because there
12	1	too there was, in our view, an insufficient
13	ć	attention paid to Rule 3.8.
14		
15	Presiding	Officer: I've got to stop you for a minute.
16		
17	CDC:	Yes, sir.
18		
19	Presiding	Officer: It's just something that's occurred
20	1	to me, Lieutenant
21		
22	APROS:	Yes, sir?
23		

Presiding Officer: Somebody approached me before we

1 came in here and asked me something about a -this actual interview that you were going to 2 play, the interview itself during this session. 3 Is that a change of plan, because -- and maybe 4 I just neglected to ask you if there was 5 anything else you wanted me to consider. 6 7 Sir, it's my understanding that the video 8 APROS: should be attached to our motion as evidence. 9 10 Presiding Officer: I don't have it. 11 12 My understanding is that you were supposed to APROS: 13 receive it. 14 15 Presiding Officer: I was told that it was going to be 16 played in here and it was a Major, I don't know 17 who he was -- a Major approached me on behalf 18 of -- I think he was one of the technical 19 people and said that it was going to be played. 20 I apologize, Mr. Ahmad. 21 22 That's all right, sir. 23 CDC:

1 APROS: Your Honor, the understanding of the government
2 was that we were going to make arrangements to
3 have it played. If you, sir, want it played,
4 our position was if you wanted --

5

6

7

8

9

Presiding Officer: If you want me to consider it, you are going to have to play it. I haven't seen the video. And I don't have it attached to anything that I was given.

10

APROS: Right, sir. The understanding -- our 11 understanding -- the way I had foreseen it, I 12 may have foreseen this incorrectly, sir. But 13 the way I had foreseen it is after argument 14 you'd probably go back and deliberate and I 15 wanted you to have the video to review while 16 you deliberate before making your decision, or 17 we had it set up in case you wished it to be 18 played. It's not our -- it was not -- we 19 weren't planning on playing the video in open 20 21 court.

22

23

24

Presiding Officer: That's what I was told you were
planning. Let me ask you, Mr. Ahmad. If I'm

1		provided a CD or something like that, I assume
2		it's going to be a CD with that apparently a
3		video with the audio of the interview where
4		Colonel Davis addressed the press on the 10th
5		would you have any objection to my just viewing
6		that in chambers? Or do you want the played
7		here in open court? Or what's your preference?
8		
9	CDC:	No, sir, I have no objection to you viewing it
10		in chambers.
11		
12	Presidin	g Officer: All right. Then we'll take at
13		some point when we get, I guess I would like
14		to see the video since it seems to be the
15		cornerstone of the arguments here or the
16		evidence here. I'd like to see the video
17		before counsel complete their arguments. I
18		think it would be helpful to know exactly what
19		said.
20		
21	APROS:	The government has no objection to that, Your
22		Honor.
23		

Presiding Officer: And Mr. Ahmad seems to be getting

1		into that right now. And you had a discussion
2		a moment ago with your client.
3		
4	CDC:	Sir, if I could have just a moment with my co-
5		counsel.
6		
7	Presidir	ng Officer: You may.
8		
9	The Defe	ense Counsel confer.
10		
11	Presidir	ng Officer: Mr. Ahmad?
12		
13	CDC:	Sir, I one question I have is: If the video
14		or the DVD is of the entire press conference?
15		
16	Presidir	ng Officer: I don't know what it is.
17		
18	CDC:	Because we were provided the defense was
19		provided with a copy of a DVD, I think, around
20		noon today. And it took until about 2:30
21		before we were able to get technological
22		ability to view it. As a result, we saw some
23		clips, and Captain Merriam just represented to
24		me that he believed that this was a video that

```
1
                was broken up into clips and wasn't necessarily
                the full sweep. That's -- I don't know if the
3
                government's had an opportunity to view it in
                its entirety, if they can comment on that.
4
5
      Presiding Officer: Lieutenant
6
7
      APROS:
                  Your Honor, with your permission, may I
                  briefly speak with the Chief Prosecutor?
9
10
       Presiding Officer: Is this Colonel Davis?
11
12
       APROS:
                  Yes, sir.
13
14
15
       Presiding Officer: All right, go ahead.
16
       Assistant trial counsel conferred with the Chief
17
       Prosecutor.
18
19
20
       APROS:
                  Your Honor, I wish to --
21
       Presiding Officer: I'm sorry. Go ahead.
22
23
                  I just spoke with my Chief Prosecutor, because
       APROS:
24
```

he watched the video on the video cassette
tape. And we know for sure it's about a hour
or so long. It is entirely complete. It is
not broken up. My understanding is the DVD is
supposed to be the same, but I have not had a
chance to review it to ensure that it is. But
we do know for sure, and it was our intent
that you got the entire press conference,
unedited with everything in there and that is
on the VHS tape, sir.

Presiding Officer: All right, so what do you guys want me to do? Do you want me to watch the video or do you want me to watch the DVD, when I say video, the VHS. Do you want me to watch the DVD? Do you all want to go watch it and then come back and tell me what you want me to watch? Apparently, you haven't seen it yourself.

21 APROS: Your Honor, I believe the -- hopefully the
22 simple answer is you could watch the VHS tape,
23 the video, since we do know for a fact that it
24 is complete.

**Presiding Officer:** Mr. Ahmad? Look we are going to take as long as we need here.

5 CDC: Yes, sir.

Presiding Officer: If you all think it's important to your respective positions, then let's take a recess, go sit down together, silently watch the videotape, watch the DVD, whatever, and then come back and tell me or show me what you want to show me. I mean I'm not -- you are the counsel here. You need to be the ones figuring out what the evidence is. If you haven't seen it, you need to see it before you can make a decision it seems to me. 

Lieutenant, if you are not sure what you got there, you need to go figure out what you got and then share that with the defense. As I said, counsel have been tasked to do something quite difficult in a very short period of time. But we will take the time necessary so that you can properly represent your clients

1	and I can make an appropriate decision. The
2	stakes are too high.
3	
4	So I guess with that said, let's take a
5	recess, you all figure out what you got. And
6	then when you are ready, come back to me and
7	if we're going to view the DVD in here, fine,
8	if you are going to give it to me to go watch
9	in chambers, fine, but we will at least know
10	what we intend to do. All right.
11	
12	The Court's in recess.
13	
14	The Commission hearing recessed at 1611,
15	12 January 2006.
16	
17	The Commission hearing was called to order at 1641,
18	12 January 2006.
19	
20	Presiding Officer: The court will come to order. All
21	those present when we recessed are again
22	present. I understand that counsel have
23	worked out whatever technical difficulties
24	there are and you want to go ahead and play

1		the video here in open court; is that correct?
2		
3	APROS:	Yes, Your Honor.
4		
5	Presiding	Officer: And we are ready to do that now?
6		
7		Before you start, my intent is that the court
8		reporter is not going to try to transcribe the
9		audio portion of this videotape. The press
10		conferences and things I've seen, it would be
11		virtually impossible. What I will direct is
12		that she indicate in her record when the
13		videotape began to play and when it stopped.
14		There will be no discussion on the record
15		until it is complete. And then the video
16		now we are looking at that DVD, correct?
17		
18	APROS:	Yes, Your Honor.
19		
20	Presiding	Officer: When this DVD is complete, it will
21		be attached to the record as a review exhibit.
22		
23	PROS:	It's actually, it's the VHS copy. There are
24		two clips that we put on the computer. The

1 DVD, because of the software we have, there were complications running it on our 2 computers. So what we will see is an exact 3 copy of the VHS video. It's broke out in --4 5 Presiding Officer: What are we going to attach to the 6 7 record. 8 9 PROS: The VHS. 10 Presiding Officer: Is that all right with the defense? 11 It seems to me it would be better to reduce it 12 to a DVD. But it would be more convenient for 13 the parties because when you give the defense 14 a copy of the record, you are going to give 15 them a copy of the VHS tape, which is rather 16 bulky and difficult. 17 18 PROS: We have a DVD as well, sir. The only problem 19 is the -- when you view it you have to have a 20 certain computer program to view it and we can 21 note that and add that to the record as well. 22 23

Presiding Officer: Any problem with that, Mr. Ahmad?

CDC:

Sir, I would just suggest that I think for the purposes of viewing this here and now, we have the means to do it and that maybe we can just agree that a DVD that works on a wide range of computers will be obtained and that will become part of the record.

Presiding Officer: All right. Let's do that and I will allow counsel to figure out and I'll give the prosecutor the responsibility to make that happen. When you get that, provide it to Mr. Ahmad or Captain Merriam for their review and approval. If it does become an issue, raise it to me and I will take care of it. All right. Let's go ahead and play the video.

The video started at 1644 hours.

20 APROS: Your Honor, for the record, this is split up
21 into two files. The first file has stopped
22 and Major is now going to play the
23 second.

1	The first	file of the video stopped at 1727 hours.
2		
3	The video	stopped at 1737 hours.
4		
5	Presiding	Officer: All right. We've heard the and
6		watch the video of the press conference. Let
7		me just make a note that at times there was
8		difficulty hearing, not the speaker, but the
9		questioner during, at least, the audio that I
10		had here.
11		
12		Lieutenant, is there anything else that you
13		want the Presiding Officer to consider?
14		
15	APROS:	No, no. If I may, I know I mentioned this in
16		the middle. I apologize if it was at an
17		inappropriate time. But I just wanted the
18		record to reflect it was in two files. And it
19		had broken up, and we had played the second
20		file.
21		
22	Presiding	Officer: All right. Mr. Ahmad, and again I
23		apologize for stopping you in the middle of
24		your argument. With that said, what I would

ask you to do is not to retrench everything

we've talked about and not to repeat

everything that's in your brief. I have read

the brief as well as all the attached

documents, to include the various rules from

the various jurisdictions that you provided to

the Commission.

Yes, sir. I -- it is my intention to only CDC: address things that have not yet been addressed and to seek to clarify based on the conversation we've already had to date today. In light of what we've just seen in the tape, what I want suggest -- what I'd like to do is return to the conversation we were having about Rule 3.6 and 3.8. 

And there's several points I'd like to make here. The first I'd like to make, sir, is that as an initial matter, of all the relevant codes that are applicable here, the D.C. rules, both 3.6 and 3.8, are the most protective of defendants and the most restrictive of prosecutors.

applicability of the D.C. rules to the Chief Prosecutor. So this, at a very minimum, is the standard that needs to be applied in looking at the statements of the Chief

The government hasn't disputed the

Prosecutor in light of the motion that we've

made.

The second thing I'd like to do, sir, is to draw a distinction between 3.6 and 3.8 based not on whether it applies to all lawyers or only to the prosecution, but to look at what the purpose of each rule is. I think that's really important in understanding then how this analysis ought to be done in considering whether these statements by the Chief Prosecutor were appropriate or not, whether they violated the rules or not.

Three point six is about the effect of pretrial publicity on the impartiality of a judge or jury or, here in the Commission process, a member. And let me just add one

most protective of the defendant, my references here are, unless I state otherwise, to the D.C. rules.

note here that since the D.C. rules are the

Three point eight, in contrast, is not about the impartiality of the judge or the jurors or here, the Presiding Officer and the members. It has an entirely different concern. Three point eight is about reputation concerns. It protects against statements of the prosecutor that heighten condemnation of the accused. There's no intent requirement. It's what effect those statements have.

If the statements of the prosecutor have the effect of increasing the condemnation or the public opprobrium that the defendant or the accused here would have in light those comments, that's a violation of the rule. So there's two ways then, two ways to slice, I think, 3.6 and 3.8. We talked about the first way, which is to whom does it apply? Three point six, to everybody; 3.8, only to

prosecutors.

This second way that I'm putting forward is that they have entirely different concerns.

Fairness of the process; and in particular, the partiality of the legal and fact finders versus reputation concerns. Three point eight, sir, I want to suggest is the gateway of analysis to what is before you today. This is for two reasons. First, 3.8 is the only rule that applies specifically to prosecutors. There's no other rule that does it. I don't believe the government can just ignore it.

In their brief as I read it, there was no mention. They didn't engage in that argument at all. The second reason that I think that 3.8 is the gateway here is that, as I noted previously, the comment to 3.8, in the rules of the District of Columbia, notes that for lawyers who are governed by the D.C. rules -- and again, unless the government says otherwise, it seems to me that is the Chief Prosecutor -- other rules beyond 3.8 may not

be as fully available. Conduct permissible under other rules other than 3.8 may not be as fully permissible -- available to the prosecutor as they are to other lawyers. The reason being that 3.8 expresses both a specific rule with regard to prosecutors and reflects a larger structural concern that prosecutors and defense lawyers play a different role in ways that we've talked about before, and I've briefed, so I won't go into that in greater detail.

The point, however, is that one cannot, I believe, under the rules of the D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct, treat the responsibilities and look at what is permissible conduct of prosecutor and defense lawyer with parity. There is not parity. The rules do not reflect parity. And the broader structure of our system of law does not reflect that parity. So when we look at the statements that were made on the video by the Chief Prosecutor, I enumerated some of those in our brief.

3

4

7

8

9

There are others that I didn't have the 2 benefit of hearing without the videotape. counted the Chief Prosecutor referring to detainees at Guantanamo Bay as terrorists six 5 I counted him saying at least three 6 times and possibly four times that he believes that Omar is guilty; Mr. Khadr is guilty. That's pronouncing quilt, sir.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

I don't think that's permissible. I think beyond that it certainly shows that this is going to have the effect of increasing the amount of public condemnation that Mr. Khadr will face. I want to add, sir, that, as you've seen in the exhibits, the story about the comments of the Chief Prosecutor have gone all over and particularly all over Canada.

19

Presiding Officer: Let's move on from that point.

21

20

All right. 22 CDC:

23

24

Presiding Officer: I don't think there's an issue that

1 there has been a very limited distribution of the comments of either Colonel Davis or 2 yourself. 3 4 CDC: Well, sir, I hear from both you and from the 5 government. 6 7 Presiding Officer: Well, let me -- I'm going to stop 8 you for just a minute. Because as -- I don't 9 think the discussion focuses entirely -- I 10 believe the government's brief focused 11 entirely on the conduct of the defense 12 counsel, primarily yourself. 13 14 Yes, sir. 15 CDC: 16 17 Presiding Officer: I don't think that the rules, with the exception possibly of the D.C. Circuit 18 Rules, require that. What they appear to 19 address is when that information is out there, 20 that got out there, that prejudices that 21 particular covered attorney, in this case, the 22 prosecution's client or the United States 23

24

Government, that it prejudices its case. And

it's not, the application of the rule doesn't seem to me to be dependent upon conduct by the defense counsel in that case.

It can be -- and I think one of the rules -- and I don't recall which one it is just now -- specifically refers to actions by third parties. There's a lot of third parties involved here, I believe. So I don't know that it -- in deciding the issue, we focus entirely on the conduct of yourself. To my knowledge, Captain Merriam has not spoken to the press. I could be wrong, but I'm not aware of anything where he has addressed the press on this issue or made any releases other than here in court.

So I don't -- but I don't think it focuses
just on your actions. I think the bigger
issue -- at least as I read the various
sections is with the exception of the D.C.
Circuit, it is the concern that a party has
been disadvantaged to the point where they are
denied a fair trial and steps are needed to be

1 taken to try to reduce the impact of that to try to rebalance the scales, if you will. 2 3 Continue, please. 4 5 Yes, sir. I believe that, as we were 6 CDC: discussing earlier, Rule 3.6c, of the North 7 Carolina rule, largely does or permits what 8 you've described in that if there is 9 substantial undue prejudicial effect to the 10 interests of a client, that it does permit a 11 12 lawyer, prosecutor, or defense to speak and make extrajudicial comments. I do think, 13 however, sir, that one cannot get to 3.6 14 before going through the gateway of 3.8. 15 16 And as I noted parenthetically before, I'd 17 like just to expand on briefly, the comment to 18 3.8 in the D.C. rules says that this may --19 you might not as a prosecutor have available 20

look at that rule --

21

22

24

to you the full breadth of conduct available

to other lawyers under rules. Sir, if you

1	Presiding Officer: You're refe	erring right now to North
2	Carolina; correct?	
3		
4	CDC: No, sir. I'm sorry	
5		
6	Presiding Officer: I thought	you went to North
7	Carolina.	
8		
9	DC: I did go to North Ca	arolina. I moved back to
10	D.C., sir. I'm sorı	cy, sir.
11		
12	Presiding Officer: Because No:	rth Carolina specifically
13	makes an exception t	that allows the prosecutor,
14	and it's under 3.8 a	and refers back to 3.6C, it
15	specifically allows	the prosecutor to take
16	those remediation st	teps to counterbalance the
17	undue prejudice for	their client.
18		
19	And I believe the A	ir Force Code has a similar
20	provision, as does t	the Navy Code, all of which
21	have that heightened	d requirement for the
22	prosecution, and all	l of them which recognize
23	where there are circ	cumstances when the
24	prosecution is not b	oound by that. And, in

fact, the D.C. Code -- and I believe it's in the comment -- does allow the prosecution, which perhaps does focus on yourself and your actions, in the way of statements, that indicates where there's been an extrajudicial allegation by the defense of unprofessional or unlawful conduct on the part of the prosecution's office.

And I tend to think that when we talk about the prosecution, we throw into that, not only the actual prosecutors, but the people that support them, and tend to roll in the entire governmental body that they represent. So one can argue that even under the D.C. provision, 3.8, there is an exception that allows the prosecution to respond under circumstances where there's been an allegation by the defense.

It limits it. It doesn't have that third party part of it, I don't think. At least not in what was provided to me. But it does allow for the prosecution to respond when there's an

1		allegation of unlawful or unprofessional
2		conduct by the prosecutor.
3		
4	CDC:	Sir, can I ask you where you're referring to
5		about the unlawful of the allegation of
6		unlawful conduct by the prosecution?
7		
8	Presiding	Officer: You're talking about in the D.C.
9		Code?
10		
11	CDC:	Yes, sir.
12		
13	Presiding	Officer: It looks like page 7 of RE-53, the
14		second page dealing with Rule 3.8. It's clear
15		down at the bottom. Actually, that appears to
16		be the last sentence. And I quote, "Also, a
17		prosecutor should be free to respond in so far
18		as necessary to any extrajudicial allegations
19		by the defense of unprofessional or unlawful
20		conduct on the part of the prosecutor's
21		office."
22		
23		And when one stands up and says that members
24		of the United States Covernment have tortured

1		an individual for whatever reason, and the
2		prosecution intends to offer, I would presume,
3		that torture information they obtained, that
4		that, to me, would be unlawful or
5		unprofessional conduct that could be
6		attributed back to the prosecutor because they
7		are now, at least, implicated because they're
8		going to make use of that.
9		
10	CDC:	Sir, respectfully, I think that is driving too
11		large a hole into the language that is at the
12		end of that rule. And I'd like to come back
13		to that by looking at what precedes it
14		immediately in comment two. This is on page 7
15		of Exhibit 53.
16		
17	Presiding	Officer: Talking about page 7?
18		
19	CDC:	Yes. Just above the paragraph to which you
20		were referring, sir.
21		
22	Presiding	Officer: All right.
23		
24	CDC:	The point here, sir, is that what I believe

3.8 does is that not only does it say as a general matter that -- and here I'll quote -"Because of the power and visibility of a prosecutor, the prosecutor's compliance with these rules and recognition of the need to refrain, even from some actions technically allowed to other lawyers under the rules, may in certain instances be of special importance."

What it then goes on to do, sir, is it specifically references 3.6 regarding extrajudicial statements.

Presiding Officer: I don't question that. I don't question that there is a limitation. What you seem to be arguing is that even in those circumstances where a -- for example, a defense counsel has alleged unprofessional or unlawful conduct on the part of the prosecution in an extrajudicial statement that the prosecution's hands are thereby tied, and he cannot respond to that. 

**5** 

\_ .

And I don't believe that's what the rule requires either in D.C. and specifically not in the other jurisdictions you've provided me the various codes for, that they specifically allow the attorneys that are representing the U.S. Government in this case to respond to inflammatory or prejudicial information that's being released and is currently being publicized that denies their client, in this case, the U.S. Government, a fair and impartial hearing.

And allegations that a procedure is a sham, that it is unfair, that the accused will be denied a fair and impartial trial are, I would submit, highly prejudicial comments. I think in our case, however, because there is a prophylactic order that is in effect, that the impact of both your statements, hopefully, as well as Colonel Davis' statements would be diminutive. And quite frankly, that's my concern, that the parties be able to have a fair and impartial trial here, that the

members that come and sit in this hearing room

do so without bringing a lot of baggage with them because of having heard allegations of 2 torture, allegations of undue pressure being 3 placed on an individual, as well as the opinions, personal opinions, of the prosecutor 5 as to guilt or innocence of the accused. 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1

4

As I said yesterday, the issue of quilt or innocence should be decided here in the courtroom, not in the forum of public discussion. It should not be decided in the press. And the articles that I was provided would indicate that there's been a tremendous effort to influence that. The only effort I'm aware of where the government has responded is Colonel Davis' press conference two days ago.

17

Sir, if I may respond, a couple of points. 18 CDC: First, looking at the government's own 19 argument about what they say they are 20 responding to -- this is in the prosecution's 21 response on Page 5, Paragraph 9, where they 22 say that much of the --23

1 Presiding Officer: Please, let me -- give me a minute. 2 CDC: Sure. 3 4 **Presiding Officer:** The prosecution's response page? 5 6 CDC: Page 5, Paragraph 9, sir. 7 8 Presiding Officer: All right. 9 10 CDC: Here, the government says through much of the 11 press conference, the Chief Prosecutor 12 confined his comments specifically in rebuttal 13 to press accounts largely manifested by the 14 defense. For example, the Chief Prosecutor's 15 comment, "It's my belief that the evidence 16 will show the accused is indeed a terrorist" 17 18 was in direct response to numerous accounts describing the accused as a fresh-faced 19 teenager in the full bloom of adolescence. 20 21 Let me stop there, sir. It's not clear to me 22 what injury is done, what substantial, undue 23 prejudicial effect is done to the government 24

1 of the United States of America by someone in a newspaper writing that Mr. Khadr is a 2 fresh-faced teenager in the full bloom of 3 adolescence. Where is the substantial undue 4 prejudicial effect to the United States 5 Government? 6 7 In answering that question, sir, I believe we 8 have to take into account the disparity between the prosecution and the defense which 10 the Fletcher case that we gite talks about. 11 The United States --12 13 Presiding Officer: Let --14 15 Yes, sir. CDC: 16 17 Presiding Officer: Is it your opinion that it has to be 18 19 a tit-for-tat sort of analogy that we have to look at each and every individual comment 20 21 during the press conference as opposed to the comments taken as a whole, given the amount of 22 adverse pretrial publicity that's been 23

24

generated, let's say, that's been favorable to

1		Mr. Khadr, or are we going to, as I said, take
2		one line, he says this. Where do we find that
3		that counterbalances? Or are we going to look
4		at all of his comments taken as a whole?
5		
6	CDC:	Sir, let me try to respond to that in two
7		ways. First, is this is the government's
8		argument. I would assume that the government
9		sought to put forth their best argument. They
10		say that
11		
12	Presiding	Officer: Well, you've taken one paragraph out
13		of a
14		
15	CDC:	Sir, I'm prepared to continue with paragraphs
16		because I think their next example is equally
17		
18		
19	Presiding	Officer: But you've taken one paragraph out
20		of a
21		
22	CDC:	Well, sir.
23		

Presiding Officer: -- eight page brief.

Yes, sir. And this is the paragraph, as I read it, which provided specific examples of what was in rebuttal to what.

5

6 Presiding Officer: All right.

7

8 CDC: The first example it seems to me is untenable. The second example, I believe, is equally 9 untenable. So I'm going by what the -- what I 10 assume the government put forth as their best 11 arguments. And on that, sir, I don't think 12 they hold up. Now, to go to your question--is 13 it a tit-for-tat? I don't think so, sir. But 14 at the same time, I do think we have to be 15 attentive to the specific language of the 16 rule, which is where there is substantial 17 undue prejudicial effect to the client, not 18 just inflammatory language, not just something 19 20 that makes us look bad.

21

22

23

24

Because in order to assess what constitutes undue prejudice, sir, we have to take into account what *Fletcher* says we need to take

inherent in any system, which in a prosecution, which is the state, and the accused, who is an individual. And in that context, where here, the state, the government, has had sole custody of my client for three and-a-half years, has had absolute control over his physical body, has had absolute control over to whom he's able to speak, has had absolute control whether he has representation to a lawyer for the first two years he was here, has had absolute control

over his knowledge of the outside world.

into account, which is the power disparity

In light of all that, sir, it is very hard for me to understand how a statement that he's a fresh-faced teenager in the full blossom of adolescence does damage. Does not just damage, substantial undue prejudicial effect to the United States Government. That, sir, I don't think holds up. And again, that's what I read to be the strongest argument of the government.

Now, can we say looking at things globally, looking at things in a totality of the circumstances that if there are statements out there that are either directly or indirectly critical of the government that the government can then respond? Well, sir, that's not what the rule says. And I don't think that we can read into it. Because once we do that, we do away with the rule entirely. This is a rule, 3.8, which sets down a marker. It's a flag that says prosecutors are different from defense lawyers. And they're different because in our system of justice, we recognize prosecutors have the advantage.

There's a quote from a case we put later in the brief that says, "It doesn't take a lot to recognize the disparity between the prosecution and the defense." In that vein, sir, the case law that we have cited in our brief -- and I won't rehearse it here -- makes clear that pretrial publicity means something different to the defense than it does to the prosecution because the prosecution has, at

its disposal, the vast resources that the defendant doesn't.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

And I would add, sir, that in this particular context pretrial publicity is not just trying it in the street instead of trying it in the court. It is not that, sir, and the case law, I think, makes that clear. This is an individual, sir, who was not allowed to talk to anybody. Even now, he can't write a letter to the Toronto Star or the New York Times or the Washington Post and say, This is what's going on with me. He's not allowed to do it, both as military counsel and as habeas counsel, sir, I was under specific restrictions. I couldn't say anything, anything at all that Mr. Khadr told me, even if he gave me authorization, pursuant to the ethical rules. I was not allowed to say it until I put that into writing and gave that to a member of the United States Government to screen it. And then I could put it out.

23

24

I give you that example, sir, because it shows

that this is not an individual like an accused
that we might think of in a typical
court-martial or in the United States in
criminal court. This is someone who's in
specific circumstances --

6

7 Presiding Officer: Couldn't in a --

8

9 CDC: If I may just finish, sir?

10

11 **Presiding Officer:** Please.

12

He's in unique circumstances, historically CDC: 13 unique, legally unique as we have found out in 14 the course of the litigation around 15 Guantanamo. It's simply not fair for us to 16 look at pretrial publicity here by the defense 17 and the prosecution and say, well, you're both 18 doing it. Because he hasn't had available to 19 him the opportunity to speak, the opportunity 20 to say anything. He could not even give his 21 name and say, I'm here. He was not allowed to 22 do that. That is unique to what's going on 23 here, sir. 24

And I think we have to take cognizance of that when we go back to the language of the rule that says, Is there substantial, undue prejudicial effect to the Government of the United States? That is a contextual decision that has to be made. It has to be made in light of who's got power and who doesn't. And here, sir, I think it's clear who's got power and who doesn't.

Presiding Officer: Let me ask you a question, a couple of questions. First of all, in a criminal trial, it's generally within the discretion or the authority of the presiding judge to issue what's typically called a "gag order" to the parties; correct?

CDC: Yes, sir.

Presiding Officer: And that would bind the -- not only the lawyers, but also the accused in that trial; correct?

1	CDC:	That's right, sir.
2		
3	Presiding	Officer: So he would be in a criminal
4		trial, that defendant in that case would be
5		prohibited from talking to the press releasing
6		information, et cetera; correct?
7		
8	CDC:	That's right, sir. I would only note the
9		government themselves note that gag orders are
10		disfavored. And they are particularly
11		disfavored for defendants as opposed to
12		prosecution precisely because of the power
13		disparity of which I've been speaking.
14		
15	Presiding	Officer: And I think also because of a
16		general belief within the American society,
17		the belief in freedom of the press to say what
18		they want to say.
19		
20	CDC:	Absolutely, sir.
21		
22	Presiding	Officer: How does the fact that Mr. Khadr has
23		been held without communication, how would
24		that in any way justify the defense violating

1 the prohibition against inflammatory or prejudicial statements in the press that harm 2 the opposing side in the case? 3 4 CDC: Again, sir, I respectfully -- I do not believe 5 that that is the standard. 6 7 Presiding Officer: I didn't ask if that was the 8 standard. You seem to be citing to the fact 9 of the unique circumstances as somehow 10 11 requiring or suggesting a need to apply the rules differently because we're here in 12 Guantanamo Bay, because the accused has been 13 held incommunicado, because he hasn't been 14 able to raise his hand and even state his name 15 that I am here as some kind of justification 16 for applying the rules differently here. 17 18 My question is: How does the fact that he was 19 held incommunicado -- how would the fact --20 for example, in any other criminal trial if an 21 individual was subject to a gag order, would 22 that justify a defense counsel from violating 23

the prohibition against releasing

1		extrajudicial statements that are inflammatory
2		or prejudicial to the opposing side?
3		
4		I think we are in agreement that rule, 3.6,
5		applies equally to the defense and the
6		government.
7		
8	CDC:	No, sir. Respectfully, we are not in
9		agreement.
10		
11	Presiding	Officer: We're not?
12		
13	CDC:	Under the D.C. rules, the comment to 3.8
14		states
15		
16	Presiding	Officer: I'm not talking about 3.8. I'm
17		talking about 3.6, which prohibits attorneys,
18		attorneys, not prosecutors, not defense
19		counsel, but attorneys, from making
20		extrajudicial comments to the press that are
21		inflammatory or prejudicial.
22		
23	CDC:	Again, sir, I do not believe respectfully that
24		the characterization of the standard as

inflammatory or prejudicial is, in fact, the standard in the rules. It's too low. Too low a standard is not the language of the rule.

And that allows the government to drive a truck through what can and can't be done.

Secondly, sir, the reason that 3.8 relates to 3.6, as I read from the comment earlier, is that it provides -- it's not just 3.8 that relates to prosecutors. Three point eight is expressing a broader, philosophical concern about the role or prosecutors. And what it states -- and is relevant to D.C., and D.C. is applicable here. What it states is that even with regard to other rules, and the one rule it references is 3.6.

Even with regard to other rules, the prosecutor may not have available to him or her the full berth of conduct that is available to another lawyer. And the reason that they don't have that full berth of conduct available to them is because they are a prosecutor. What that means, sir, is that I

do not agree that 3.6 applies equally with regard to the prosecution and the defense.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

And secondly, as I said, I don't respectfully agree with the characterization of the rule. I think we need to be very careful about the language that we use, because it's too dangerous to just say, Everybody is doing something. The last thing I would say, sir, which I hope is responsive to the call of your question, why does it matter what his conditions are? Why is that relevant to the analysis? Because, sir, I see that as an extension of the rationale for why there's a difference in the application of the ethical rules to the prosecution and the defense in the first place. It's a recognition of the fact that the prosecution and the defense are differently situated. That they are differently situated with respect to resources, but also with respect to the

23

24

And let me just say, sir, that the case law

ability to get their story out.

that we have cited talks about how if one invokes -- and we don't even know if these are available in this process, but if one invokes one's fifth amendment right and if one invokes one's sixth amendment right, the consequence might be absolute silence by the defendant and that puts the defendant in an unfair situation with respect to the government. That's what the case law says. My argument with regard to his particular situation here at Guantanamo, where he has even less access than a criminal defendant say in a court-martial or in a criminal court in the United States, is just an extension of that. I think it's an extension that is logical. I think it's one that's warranted. I think the only reason that it's not been made is that Guantanamo is historically an anomaly for us. It's not something we have a great deal of experience We don't have a record for it, but in with. light of the situation I think it's appropriate to make that extension of argument.

24

Presiding Officer: All right. Thank you. 1 2 CDC: I'm sorry. I have one last point I'd like to 3 address with regard to the remedy issue. I 4 can hold it if you'd like me to. 5 6 Presiding Officer: How long is it going to take you 7 because we've been on the record for a while 8 and I need to give everybody a break. 9 10 Yes, sir. CDC: 11 12 Presiding Officer: If you can do it quickly. 13 14 I can. Sir, I just want to respond to an CDC: 15 issue that is raised by the government in 16 their brief with regard to remedy. If I read 17 their brief correctly, I believe that they are 18 suggesting -- even if you were to find that 19 there was any kind of inappropriate statement. 20 21 which required remediation, that the appropriate way to handle that would be to 22 issue instructions to members and then permit 23

24

voir dire on the matter. I would expect that

we would have that opportunity for voir dire any way, so I'm not sure that the adds anything. What you do want to say, however, sir, and I'd like to make reference to a case -- this is something that I did not include because its rebuttal to the government's brief. This is the case of United States versus Koubriti,

K-O-U-B-R-I-T-I, 305 2D 723. It's from the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan decided in December of 2003.

And the reason I'm raising this, sir, is that this case involves what were deem to be prejudicial statements made by the Attorney General of the United States outside of the courtroom, extra-judicial statements. And what the court held in this case, and I'm quoting, is that, quote, Although the extensive voir dire revealed no actual prejudice to the defendant's right to a fair trial, the court cannot help but include that an unfounded statement linking an individual

1 of middle eastern origin to the September 11th attacks is a reasonably likely to prejudice 2 this individual's subsequent criminal trial, 3 end quote. This is on page --4

5

Presiding Officer: Are you going the give this to me? 6

7

Yes, sir. CDC: 8

9

Presiding Officer: Okay. Rather than read it into the 10 record, it would probably be more efficient to allow me to read it. 12

13

11

Yes, sir. And if I could just conclude by 14 CDC: saying that I believe that what this case 15 helps us to see is that just permitting voir 16 dire does not cure what 3.8 is concerned 17 about, which is about reputation and the 18 heightened public condemnation that results 19 from comments such as the one made by the 20 Attorney General here and such is the comments 21 that I believe fall into that rule in the 22 videotape that we saw by the Chief Prosecutor. 23

1	If I may approach, sir, I have copies of these
2	for the prosecution and for the court.
3	
4	Presiding Officer: Please. All right, I've been told
5	that the videotape that we watched is going to
6	be marked as RE-62. The case that Mr. Ahmad
7	gave me is marked as RE-63 and I'll go ahead
8	and read it. And I've conferred with counsel
9	briefly. We are going to take a recess at
10	this point. During the recess, we are going
11	to make it for an hour, give everybody a
12	chance to have dinner. We'll come back. I
13	want to go gavel down at 1915.
14	
15	The court's in recess.
16	
17	The Commission hearing was called to order at 1813,
18	12 January 2006.
19	
20	The Commission hearing was called to order at 1917,
21	12 January 2006.
22	
23	Presiding Officer: The hearing will come to order. All
24	those present when we recessed are again

1		present.
2		
3		Mr. Ahmad, was there anything else that you
4		wanted to say? And, again, I am not inviting
5		additional comment outside of the brief and
6		what you've already said.
7		
8	CDC:	No, sir, there is not.
9		
10	Presiding	Officer: All right. Lieutenant
11		
12	APROS:	Yes, sir?
13		
14	Presiding	Officer: And, again, I would remind you of
15		the same parameter that I gave to the defense
16		to confine your arguments to things outside
17		your brief or if there is something that came
18		up during the defense brief if you want to
19		make a comment about that you may.
20		
21	APROS:	Aye, aye, sir.
22		
23		In fact, I want to start off exactly where the
24		defense left off with the Koubriti case if I

24

may, sir. And together with that the McVeigh There is a very important fact in both of those cases that is not present here. both of those cases, which involved immense pretrial publicity. McVeigh, of course, the Oklahoma City bombing. These defendants September 11th attacks on terrorism. defense in those cases came to an agreement immediately in the beginning of the case with the government to have an order put out to limit pretrial publicity. That is not present The defense has never come to us and asked us will you agree to an order to limit any kind of pretrial publicity. In fact, for two years at least -- at least a year, possibly two years, the government has sat quietly while the defense has been doing a public relations battle and assault against us. So I think it's important to note you've signed three -- or two protective orders about to sign three and there is not one proposed from the defense asking for a mutual agreement by both parties to limit the rhetoric outside of the courtroom.

1		
2	Presiding	Officer: How long, if you know, has Mr. Ahmad
3		been representing Mr. Khadr?
4		
5	APROS:	I believe he's been representing since the
6		onset of the habeas petition.
7		
8	Presiding	Officer: And when did that start.
9		
10	APROS:	I don't have that date in front of me. But I
11		know I'm pretty sure the accused's habeas
12		petition has been it's been in court for a
13		substantial time because if I'm not mistaken
14		it's a big part of it was decided by the
15		District Court and it's now in front of the
16		District Court of Appeals, so it's got to be
17		over a year.
18		
19	Presiding	Officer: The Khadr case is before the Circuit
20		Court.
21		
22	APROS:	On the habeas petition. His habeas petition
23		is currently before the D.C. Court of Appeals

specifically on the issue of the CSRTs and his

1		detention.
2		
3	Presiding	Officer: All right. Continue please.
4		
5	APROS:	I think that's an important fact to consider.
6		And if you look at our Chief Prosecutor's
7		comments. This was the first time that he
8		stood up and decided to say, Hey, I need to
9		say something back to some of these
10		inflammatory remarks. And that's why in my
11		brief if I could refer you back to Page 5,
12		Paragraph 9 that the defense addressed.
13		
14	Presiding	Officer: Of your brief?
15		
16	APROS:	Of my brief. Yes, Your Honor.
17		
18	Presiding	Officer: All right.
19		
20	APROS:	I'd like to say in response to the defense.
21		First I'd like to say thank you for the
22		compliment on the brief. Had I had more time,
23		this would not have been an acceptable product
24		for you. Given the time that I had, I don't

4 5 6

9

7

8

12

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

21

20

22

24

23

want this to be considered the sole and only -- or best argument for the government. It is the best argument I had in the few hours I had to prepare it. So to statements that I use in here and in contrast to what he's addressing in rebuttal is not limited to be the only thing he's possibly rebutting. fact, his statement where he says, "I would not take someone if I didn't believe they were quilty." Is not just in response to the one statement about "a fresh faced teenager." It's in response also to the accusations that we are part of a shame process, that somehow the government is making up evidence. That somehow the government is in bed with the

Your Honor, you are not presiding over a kangaroo court. And he was simply making it well known to the public that I've reviewed each and everyone of these cases and I would not bring them before this process unless I believed that I could prove their guilt beyond

Presiding Officer and the members and this is

all a shame.

a reasonable doubt. That's what he's telling the public. That's completely appropriate. It may be a hard blow, but it was not a foul blow. Especially in light of the publicity that we have to respond to now due to the inflammatory remarks from the other side.

The only other point, Your Honor, I'd like to make is this, being a judge for the time that you have, I'm sure you are aware of the term "An accused is not allowed to use the protections that are supposed to shield him as a sword." These protections in 3.8 and in 3.6 are meant to shield him so that he gets a full and fair trial. And so that the government does not do anything to cause extra condemnation upon him than what will happen simply by the charge sheet becoming public.

He's not allowed to take these rules and now use them as a sword believing that the government has their hands tide behind their back and cannot respond. If you look at the McVeigh case, if you look at especially the

1

Koubriti case. You'll see that the government especially in the Koubriti case broke the deal. They broke the order of the deal between the parties when they made their comments. I would submit to you that if Colonel Davis gave this trial, this press conference a day before yesterday without the defense ever saying anything, I would submit to you he may have very well violated the rules. But in response, he has a client to defend the government and we have a right to represent to its people and the people of the world that we are going to give the accused in an open proceeding a full and fair trial, which he mentioned nine times in that press conference. That was the purpose of it. And I believe when you saw it I hope that you would also see that that's where he was at.

22

23

24

And a final point, it just came to mind, I want to address, if you feel it's necessary, why I really don't address 3.8 versus 3.6. It's the government's opinion that which is applicable here is whether or not the accused

will receive a full and fair trial. That's what we have to look at. A full and fair trial obviously does not mean a trial biased in his favor. It means full and fair for both parties.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

5

Three point eight talks about prosecution comments designed to put greater public condemnation on the accused. In that respect if all that happens is public condemnation of the accused through comments of a prosecutor and it has absolutely no bearing on a full and fair trial for an accused, that's really not what's relevant here. Because the appropriate remedy there is for the ethics people to take cognizance of it and issue sanctions should that be necessary. What's appropriate here, what's equal for both sides is that it's a full and fair trial. They equally cannot say statements that would prohibit either side from getting a full and fair trial. standard is not the government can't say anything that may have any tendency to stop a full and fair trial like relevancy, but they

have a standard that says they can say

anything unless it's beyond a reasonable doubt

that it will do that. They are equal

standards. The law looks at it equally. Both

sides have an equal obligation to do it.

Unless you have any other questions, sir...

## Presiding Officer: I would ask your opinion,

Lieutenant, as to the position of the prosecution as I've been referred to I believe four different jurisdictions ethic code. That governing to naval service, that governing the Air force, the D.C. Bar, and the North Carolina Bar. What, in your opinion, would be the standard if I were to apply one that I would look to. And Mr. Ahmad I'll ask you that same question in a moment, so you get the advantage to think about it.

20 APROS: If I may in answering that question, I would
21 like to submit to you, it's two pages, another
22 section of the D.C. Bar, which is part of this
23 answer. I've already provided a copy of
24 the -- to the defense before coming in here.

\_\_\_

1		And it talks about the scope of the D.C. Bar
2		rules, which I think will answer the question
3		as to the D.C. Bar rules and then I'll address
4		the other rules if I may, sir.
5		
6	Presiding	Officer: Have you seen this, Mr. Ahmad?
7		
8	CDC:	I have. Yes, sir.
9		
10	Presiding	Officer: All right. Bring it up here please.
11		
12	The assist	ant trial counsel did as directed.
13		
14	Presiding	Officer: I'm going to take a minute and read
15		this and as I do or before I do, I just
16		remind counsel that if you are going to offer
17		something, please have it marked before so we
18		don't waste time doing that here.
19		
20	APROS:	Aye, aye, sir. I'm sorry.
21		
22	Presiding	officer perusing exhibit.
23		

Presiding Officer: All right, I've read RE-64. What's

## your comment about it?

2

1

3 APROS: Your Honor, I'd like to refer you to the bottom of Page 1, very last line where it 4 starts with moreover to the beginning of Page 5 2, where it reads "moreover nothing in these 6 rules associated comments or this scope 7 section is intended to confer rights on an 8 adversary of a lawyer to enforce the rules in 9 a proceeding other than a disciplinary 10 proceeding." I don't believe these rules 11 12 apply. I would also say what does apply, first and foremost, always in these 13 proceedings is Commission Law. And you have 14 and order, sir, both from the Secretary of 15 Defense and the President of the United 16 States, make sure the accused receives a full 17 and fair trial. Implicit in that order you 18 being able to take all actions necessary and 19 appropriate to ensure he receives a full and 20 fair trial. So if you took away every rule of 21 ethics out there, you still have the authority 22 just under Commission Law to govern the 23 conduct of counsel before these proceedings to 24

make sure the accused receives a full and fair

trial. That's what really applies. That's

the standard. And I think judging against

that and the actions of counsel is how you

should decide this case -- or this issue.

Excuse me, sir.

7

8

Presiding Officer: All right. Thank you. Mr. Ahmad.

9

Sir, if I heard the government correctly, they 10 CDC: just wrote out of Commission Law all rules of 11 ethics from any jurisdiction. That's in 12 contradiction -- that directly contradicts 13 Appointing Authority Regulation Number 3, 14 which states that the rules of ethics of the 15 different services as well as the states or 16 jurisdictions in which the attorneys 17 practicing belong are Commission Law in 18 19 addition to whatever other rules and regulations, MCIs, MCOs, et cetera. So it 20 seems quite clear to me that the rules of D.C. 21 apply. That's what Appointing Authority 22 Regulation 3 says. 23

1 As to between D.C., North Carolina, so on and so forth, my position, and I think this is 2 well supported, is that these are concurrent 3 bodies of -- these are concurrent regulatory 4 bodies. The most restrictive rule for the 5 prosecution is what would apply. In my 6 reading with the rules that we are talking 7 about, that is D.C. And one would have to go 8 through the analysis for all of them since all of them apply. And as we've discussed they 10 are quite similar. But the differences matter 11 and they are there for a reason between them. 12 But I would submit that D.C. is the one that 13 we should be looking at. It is the one that 14 places the greatest restriction on the 15 prosecution. Given the nature of this motion, 16 I think that's most appropriate. 17 Presiding Officer: All right. Thank you. It's 1930 19

18

20

21

22

I'd like to go gavel down at 1950 and I'll give you my decision at that time. Court's in recess.

23

24

The Commission hearing recessed at 1933,

1	12 January 2006.
2	
3	The Commission hearing was called to order at 2016,
4	12 January 2006.
5	
6	Presiding Officer: The Commission will come to order.
7	All those present when we recessed are again
8	present.
9	
10	Again, I apologize for the delay. I intended
11	to start earlier but it took me a little
12	longer than I anticipated. Also, I want to,
13	again, thank counsel for their briefs and
14	their arguments. They were all, I think, very
15	helpful to me in deciding the issue.
16	
17	In deciding the issue before the Commission,
18	I'm going to enter the following findings of
19	facts and conclusions of law:
20	
21	1. It is my role to rule on the allegation of
22	prosecutorial misconduct. As such, a
23	violation of an applicable ethical obligation
24	of an attorney practicing before the

Commission can constitute prosecutorial misconduct. In addition, it could deny an opponent a full and fair trial before the Tribunal. Under either or both categories, such a violation would authorize me in my role as the Presiding Officer to take steps that I believe are necessary to ensure there is a full and fair hearing as required by the Presidential Order and the implementing Military Commission Order Number 1.

2. I have reviewed the documents offered as REs-53, 55, 60, 63 and the videotape of the news conference given on 10 January 2006.

3. I will provide preliminary findings now and rule on the motion and I may attach more detailed findings to the record at a later date.

4. For this motion the defense carries the burden of persuasion and must establish their case by a preponderance of the evidence.

1 5. In making the ruling, I've considered the evidence submitted by both sides, the argument 2 of counsel, and the legal briefs submitted by 3 the parties. 4 5 I make the following findings of fact: 6 6. 7 A. On 10 January 2006, Colonel Morris 8 Davis, United States Air Force was the Chief Prosecutor for the Office of Military 10 Commission. 11 12 B. On 10 January 2006, Colonel Davis was 13 authorized by the Appointing Authority to 14 speak with the press concerning cases pending 15 before military Commissions. 16 17 C. On 10 January 2006, Colonel Davis 18 participated in a press conference attended by 19 reporters representing many news organizations. 20 21 D. At the above news conference Colonel 22 23 Davis made a number of statements, many 24 contained in the REs, mentioned above, as well

1 as the videotape or rather the videotape of the press conference that were widely reported 2 in the news media. 3 4 E. Some of Colonel Davis' statements 5 specifically addressed the case of U.S. v 6 Khadr, while others addressed the issues of 7 U.S. v al Bahlul and military Commissions in 8 general. 9 10 F. Many of Colonel Davis' comments 11 extended beyond that normally heard from a 12 military prosecutor. 13 14 15 G. Mr. Ahmad represents Mr. Khadr. Having been detailed to this case on 28 16 November 200[5] and making a formal appearance 17 on 22 December 200[5]. 18 19 H. Mr. Ahmad has made several statements 20 to the press prior to 10 January 2006 in which 21 he made negative characterizations of the U.S. 22 Government's actions in this case -- rather in 23

24

the case of *U. S. v Khadr* specifically, and

1 negative characterizations of the Commission process generally. In addition, he has made 2 statements that attribute unlawful and 3 unprofessional conduct to the prosecutor's 4 office. 5 6 I. On 1 December 2005, I sent initial 7 instructions to all appointed members 8 instructing them not to read or listen to any accounts of the Commission and not to discuss 10 11 the Commission with anyone. 12 J. On 20 December 2005, Colonel Davis, 13 Mr. Ahmad and Captain Merriam were informed of 14 and provided a copy of my initial instructions 15 to the members. 16 17 7. Conclusions of Law: 18 19 A. To prevail on this motion, the 20 defense must show that Colonel Davis made an 21 extra-judicial statement which serves to 22 heighten condemnation of the accused or had a 23

24

substantial likelihood of materially

prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding and were not in response to a defense allegation of unlawful or unprofessional conduct by the prosecutor's office or that the attorney reasonably believed they were required to protect a client from a substantial undue prejudicial effect of recent publicity not initiated by the prosecutor.

B. While Colonel Davis' statements were extrajudicial, and are potentially harmful to a criminal proceeding, they also appear to be intended and necessary to respond to a defense allegation of unlawful or unprofessional conduct by the Prosecutor's Office and to protect the U.S. Government and the Military Commission from the substantial undue prejudice effect -- prejudicial effect of recent publicity initiated by persons or entities other than the U.S. Government or the Military Commissions.

C. Having reviewed the evidence and in view of the findings of fact, I find the

defense has not met their burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that Colonel Davis' statements violated his ethical obligations.

D. In applying the ethics codes of all four jurisdictions cited by the defense, the outcome remains the same.

E. Alternatively, to establish prosecutorial misconduct, the defense would prevail by showing that Colonel Davis' actions denied the accused or will deny the accused fair and full trial before the Commission.

Having reviewed the evidence and considering the findings as set forth above, in particular in light of the initial instructions sent to all of the members, I find the defense has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that Colonel Davis' actions will deny the accused a full and fair trial.

Accordingly, the defense motion is denied.

1		
2		Is there anything else either side desires to
3		take up before we adjourn for the evening?
4		
5	PROS:	No, sir.
6		
7	DC:	No, sir.
8		
9	Presiding	Officer: If there is nothing further, the
10		proceeding will be in recess.
11		
12	The Commis	sion hearing recessed at 2023,
13	12 January	2006.
14		
15		[END OF PAGE]

## AUTHENTICATION OF FINAL SESSION TRANSCRIPT

in the case of:

United States v. Omar Ahmed Khadr a/k/a/ Akhbar Farhad a/k/a Akhbar Farnad

This is to certify that the Pages <u>1</u> through <u>231</u> are an accurate and verbatim transcript of the proceedings held in the above styled case on <u>January 11 and 12</u>, <u>2006</u>.

Robert S. Chester Colonel, USMC

16 February 2006
DATE